DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 469 CG 008 861

AUTHOR	Weinrach, Stephen G.
TITLE	The Relationship Between the Level of Counselor Self-Actualization and Student Perception of the Guidance Program.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	148p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Toledo
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Characteristics; *Counselor Evaluation; Doctoral Theses; Field Studies; *Guidance Programs; High School Students; Perception; *Self Actualization; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Personal Orientation Inventory

ABSTRACT

This field study was undertaken to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program. Self-actualization was measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). Student perception of the guidance program was measured by Wysong's Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey (GPES). The sample for this study included counselors in 23 Ohio high schools and their respective 11th grade students. The categories of the GPES were: Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor; Guidance Program Activities and Provisions; Guidance Objectives; Identification of Persons in School Who Are Regarded as the Most Helpful in Assisting Students to Accomplish Guidance Objectives; and Semantic Differential Items Used to Rate Generally the Guidance Program. The grand mean serves as an overall index of student perception of the entire guidance program. Guidance programs which received a high rating by students tended to be administered by counselors who received high scores on the Time-Competence scale of the POI. A Time-Competent Individual tends to be able to respond to the needs and expectations of the moment while simultaneously placing them into their proper perspective in terms of the past and future. (Author)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 090469

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED BY

STEPHEN G. WEINRACH

OPERATING
NATIONAL IN
REPRO
SYSTEM RE
COPYRIGHT

CG 008 861

Dr. Stephen G. Weinrach
Department of Education
Villanova University
Villanova, Pa. 19085

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Abstract of

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF COUNSELOR SELF-ACTUALIZATION AND STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM

Stephen G. Weinrach

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the Doctor of
Philosophy in Education Degree

The University of Toledo
August 1972

This field study was undertaken to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program. Self-actualization was measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). Student perception of the guidance program was measured by Wysong's Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES). The sample for this study included counselors in twenty-three Ohio high schools who completed the POI and their respective eleventh grade students who completed the GPES.

For the purposes of hypothesis testing an overall index of self-actualization was used by combining the two basic scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory which are the Time Competent (T_C) and Inner-Directed (I). The scores on five categories and the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey were correlated with the combined T_C and I score of the POI for all twenty-three schools. The categories of the GPES were: Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor (A_1); Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7}); Guidance Objectives (B); Identification of Persons in School who are Regarded as the Most Helpful in Assisting Students to Accomplish Guidance Objectives (D); and Semantic Differential Items Used to Rate Generally the Guidance Program (E). The grand mean serves as an overall index of student perception of the entire guidance program. A t-test to determine whether the Pearson Product Moment coefficient of correlation differed significantly from zero was computed with alpha set at .05 for each of the correlations.

The results of the hypothesis testing indicate that three of the six hypotheses achieved a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the POI with two categories and the grand mean of the GPES. The two categories are A_{2-7} and D. There were no significant correlations between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured

by the combined T_C and I score of the POI with the following three categories of the GPES: A_1; B, and: E. Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected for these categories.

Guidance Programs which received a high rating by students tended to be administered by counselors who received high scores on the Time-Competence scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory. Such an individual is characterized as dealing primarily with the "here and now." According to Shostrom (1966:15): "He is able to tie the past and the future to the present in a meaningful continuity. He appears to be less burdened by guilts, regrets and resentments..." A Time-Competent individual tends to be able to respond to the needs and expectations of the moment while simultaneously placing them into their proper perspective in terms of the past and the future.

Additional longitudinal field research is needed. Counselor sex, age and type and extent of graduate training need to be correlated with student perception of the guidance program. Student sex and age and the type of counseling contact the student has received should be correlated separately with counselor personality.

A Dissertation

entitled

The Relationship Between the Level of Counselor Self-Actualization and Student Perception of the Guidance Program

by
Stephen G. Weinrach

as partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the Doctor of Philosophy in Education Degree

Jeffrey K. Messing

Robert A. Bemhoft

H. Eugene Wysong

Thomas V. Miller

John J. [illegible]
Dean of the Graduate School

The University of Toledo
August 1972

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF COUNSELOR SELF-ACTUALIZATION AND STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
The University of Toledo

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in
Education

---

by

Stephen G. Weinrach

August 1972

Copyright by
Stephen G. Weinrach
1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is difficult to express my appreciation within the confines of one page for the warmth, caring and assistance which my committee provided. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Jeffrey K. Messing, chairman, Dr. Robert A. Bernhoft and Dr. H. Eugene Wysong. Dr. Stephen Jurs made an invaluable contribution in the area of statistics and data processing. I would not be writing this page in the first place if it were not for the faith, confidence, encouragement and love that my best friend consistently displayed. Thanks Esther.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

Chapter I

NEED FOR STUDY 1

Hypotheses to Be Tested 6

Additional Data 9

Definition of Terms 10

Limitations 10

Delimitations 11

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

Overview 13

Counselor Personality 14

Students as a Source of Input 23

Summary 30

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY 33

OVERVIEW 33

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE 34

INSTRUMENTATION 37

Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). 38

Page

Chapter III (Continued)

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (*GPES*) 42

COLLECTION OF DATA 45

Population 45

Instrumentation 45

Procedures 46

ANALYSIS OF DATA 47

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 47

Personal Orientation Inventory 51

Correlational Analyses 52

Supplementary Data 53

Chapter IV

RESULTS 55

OVERVIEW 55

RESULTS 56

Hypothesis I 56

Hypothesis II 58

Hypothesis III 60

Hypothesis IV 62

Hypothesis V 63

Hypothesis VI 63

SUMMARY 64

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS 66

OVERVIEW 66

Page

Chapter V (Continued)

DISCUSSION 70

Instruments 72

The School Environment 73

RECOMMENDATIONS 77

APPENDICIES 82

BIBLIOGRAPHY 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Counselor Sex 35
2. Counselor Certification in the State of Ohio 35
3. Years Experience as a Counselor 35
4. Counselor Reported Memberships in Selected Professional Organizations Related to Counseling . . 36
5. Total Number of Memberships Held in Any or All of the Following Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance Association; Ohio School Counselors Association; or a Local or Regional School Counselors Organization 36
6. Student Response to GPES Verification Items Upon Which the Final Sample for this Study was Based . . . 37
7. Number of Grade Eleven Students in Each School Whose Surveys Constituted the Sample Used in this Study 37
8. Matrix of Correlations between Selected Scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory with the Categories and Scales of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey 57
9. Student Rankings of Ways in which Some Counselors Can be of Help to Students Based on a Frequency Distribution of 1,658 Students' Responses to Questions 101 to 105 of the GPES 74
10. Student Ranking of the Most Important Reason for Being in School Based on 1,658 Students 75
11. Kuder-Richardson Reliability Coefficients for the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 Based on 1,658 High School Students 117
12. Reliability Coefficients for the Personal Orientation Inventory 119

Table Page

13. Matrix of Correlations Between the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES) 121

14. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Personal Orientation Inventory Based on Twenty-three Counselors 124

15. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 Based on Twenty-three Groups of High School Students 125

16. Frequency of Student Responses to Item 101: Student Rating of the Most Important Way in Which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students 127

17. Frequency of Student Responses to Item 102: Student Rating of the Second Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students. 128

18. Frequency of Student Responses to Item 103: Student Rating of the Third Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students 129

19. Frequency of Student Responses to Item 104: Student Rating of the Fourth Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students 130

20. Frequency of Student Responses to Item 105: Student Rating of the Least Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students 131

Chapter I

NEED FOR STUDY

Research efforts to discover and define the characteristics of the effective counselor have been diverse and numerous, both regarding research design and establishing a single criterion by which to measure counselor effectiveness. According to Winborn and Rowe (1972:26) the potential dividends of such research have prompted investigators to search for that trait or combination of traits which will help identify or predict those counselor-trainees who will make effective counselors. The research findings vary with the nature of the procedures and samples employed (Demos & Zuwaylif, 1966; Form, 1953; Foulds, 1969b; Jackson & Thompson, 1971; McClain, 1968b; McQuary, 1964; Pellegreno, 1968; Price & Iverson, 1969).

Counselor personality studies have tended to produce mixed results. Many of the studies reviewed by Cottle in 1953 relied upon the preparation of lists of desirable counselor personality characteristics by administrators and counselor-educators. Despite the availability of more sophisticated research methodology, desirable personality characteristics of counselors have not been clearly identified, defined or agreed upon (Carkhuff, 1966).

The study of counselor personality has been the focal point of research by counselor-educators for more than twenty-five years (Hill & Green, 1960; Stripling & Lister, 1963). Polmantier (1966) suggested in 1947 and again in 1966 that there is a need for research dealing with personal characteristics of the counselor. Polmantier (1966:95) concluded ". . . that there is much yet to be known about the personal characteristics of counselors, as well as the significance of these characteristics for success in counseling." Cottle (1953:449) in commenting on how these personal characteristics could be measured, stated: "Interest inventories and structured personality inventories seem to offer a promising area of investigation in the identification of characteristics of counselors."

Donnan, Harlan and Thompson (1969) recommended that additional research should be conducted into the personality traits which are associated with facilitiating counselor behavior. In the past few years there have been numerous investigations of counselor personality (Carkhuff, 1966; Demos & Zuwaylif, 1966; Jackson & Thompson, 1971). The results of counselor personality studies might be more fruitful, according to McQuary (1964) if greater emphasis were placed upon investigating the counselor's personal value orientation rather than the preparation of lists of desirable counselor characteristics or traits.

With the emergence of NDEA Guidance Institutes it became increasingly more feasible to study the personality characteristics of counselor-trainees in large groups. The criterion for counselor effectiveness rested upon the ratings of supervisors, peers or administrators (Walton & Sweeney, 1969). Unfortunately, most of the subjects used in these studies were practicum students rather than fully trained and experienced counselors (Johnson _et al_., 1967).

The expectations and demands placed upon the counselor who is working in a public secondary school differ from those placed upon practicum students and college counselors. The distinction between success as a counselor-trainee or practicum student and on-the-job success must be considered. Warnath, as quoted by Hill and Green (1960:117) suggested ". . . that the kinds of characteristics valued in the training setting were not always the same as those needed on the job later." According to Jackson and Thompson (1971) a limitation of previous research in counseling has been the use of counselors-in-training rather than experienced counselors as subjects. Public school counselors working in the field have tended to be overlooked as research subjects.

Researchers have also tended to ignore students as a source of input for the evaluation of guidance programs (Jenson, 1955). In studies where student input has been used, it has generally been limited to surveying only those students who received direct service. In reality this represented only a small portion of students for whom the counselor was responsible. Research investigating the effect of the counseling interview is necessary. In the past, the effect of the entire guidance program has tended to be ignored as a subject for investigation.

Walton and Sweeney's (1969) and Hill and Green's (1960) extensive reviews of the literature contain only a few references to studies where the recipients of counseling were employed as judges of counselor effectiveness. The reviews cited above included studies which were conducted in both clinical and school settings. Among the criteria used to evaluate counselor effectiveness were (a) a semantic differential type questionnaire measuring student preference for different individuals to help them; (b) a semantic differential type questionnaire measuring student feeling about counselor help; (c) patient global approval scales; (d) score change on a discomfort scale, and; (e) symptom improvement scale completed after the conclusion of therapy.

It would appear from the reviews of the literature by Walton and Sweeney (1969) and Hill and Green (1960) that where recipients of counseling have been employed as judges of counselor effectiveness they have tended to be limited to the clinical setting rather than the school. Where students in the school setting have judged the effectiveness of the counselor it has been limited to only those students who received counseling. Clearly the job of the school counselor is not limited to only those students who receive individual counseling.

The following studies have helped to establish the precedent for using student perception as a source of input. Most of the studies limited the scope of their investigations to student perception of counseling per se. Form (1953) recognized the importance of surveying student attitudes toward counseling by conducting an extensive follow-up study of those students who sought counseling assistance from the Michigan State College Counseling Center during 1951. According to Form (1953:84):

> The operation of a counseling organization is probably more affected by the prevailing climate of opinion toward it than is the case for an academic department. The effectiveness of counseling by its very nature depends upon the willingness on the part of the students to use it. This in turn, reflects the attitudes that students have concerning the value of counseling. Thus it is important for personnel agencies to know the prevailing attitudes, sentiments and prejudices that students have toward them to do effective work.

Jenson (1955) using a similar rationale surveyed high school students' attitudes toward counseling which they had received. Jenson worked in cooperation with teachers, counselors and administrators in his school district. Jenson (1955:498) contended:

> . . . it struck us that consumer reaction determines the destiny of most, if not all, professional service. . . . Despite. . . known weaknesses of the criterion of student feeling . . . it at least provides us with an index to what students think about counseling and counselors-how they think their self-understanding and adjustment have been affected.

Tipton (1969) also used secondary school students in her investigation of students' attitudes towards their counselors' performance of vocational, educational and personal counseling. In the Tipton (1969:3805-A) study students were asked to rank those "persons or things which . . . influenced their attitudes toward counselors." Wortman (1969:145-A) surveyed fifth grade students' perceptions of their own unmet needs and attitudes toward their counselor. An adapted version of the SRA Junior Inventory and a check list identifying twenty-five helping behaviors were used. Students appeared most concerned about "grades, passing, and being smarter in school." The counselor's rank as a preferred helper was seventh. Both the Tipton (1969) and Wortman (1969) studies surveyed students in the school setting.

Although the Jenson (1955), Form (1953), Tipton (1969) and Wortman (1969) studies used students as a source of input, the results were not correlated with counselor personality characteristics. None of the studies cited above investigated the total range of school guidance services at the secondary level. In conclusion, the studies which have used students as a source of input have generally been limited to surveying only those students who received direct service from the counselor or in a setting other than the secondary school.

In summary, there seems to be a wealth of studies which have correlated the results of counselor completed personality instruments with supervisor or client rating of the counseling relationship or client satisfaction. There have also been several recent studies which have surveyed student attitudes toward counseling in particular and guidance programs in general. Most of the research which deals with counselor personality has been conducted in a university setting. There is a limited amount of research which deals with counselor personality which has been conducted in the field.

To some extent, both counselor personality and student perception of the guidance progarm have been investigated separately. There appears to be virtually no research which has correlated counselor personality with student perception of their guidance program. It is, therefore, appropriate and necessary to investigate the relationship between counselor personality and student perception of their guidance program. This investigation will attempt to answer the question: What is the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program?

Hypotheses to be Tested

Hypothesis I.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the counselor as measured by Category A_1 of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the counselor as measured by Category A_1 of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Hypothesis II.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions as measured by Category A_{2-7} of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions as measured by Category A_{2-7} of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Hypothesis III.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the attainment of guidance objectives as measured by Category B of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the attainment of the guidance objectives as measured by Category B of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Hypothesis IV.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance as measured by Category D of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance as measured by Category D of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Hypothesis V.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student evaluation of the guidance program as measured by Category E of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student evaluation of the guidance program as measured by Category E of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Hypothesis VI.

H_0: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of their entire guidance program as measured by the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of their entire guidance program as measured by the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Additional Data

There is ample support for the use of the combined Time Competent and Inner-Directed score as a single index of the level of counselor self-actualization (Damnn, 1969; Foulds, 1967; Knapp, 1971; Murray, 1968; Winborn & Rowe, 1972). Nevertheless, it seems both appropriate and reasonable to include data pertaining to the relationship between each of the five categories and the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey with the separately computed Time Competent and Inner-Directed scores. It also seems appropriate to include data pertaining to the relationship between all of the GPES scales with the separately computed as well as the combined Time Competent and Inner-Directed scores of the POI.

Definition of Terms

1. Counselor: For the purposes of this study, the operational definition of "counselor" is the individual who has been designated as responsible for the administration and implementation of the guidance program.
2. Guidance Program: For the purposes of this study, the operational definition of "guidance program" is the program for which the counselor has been designated responsible.
3. Selected Professional Organizations: For the purposes of this study, the operational definition of "selected professional organizations" is membership in any of the following: American Personnel and Guidance Association, Ohio School Counselors Association or a local or regional school counselors association.
4. Level of Self-Actualization: For the purposes of this study the operational definition of "level of self-actualization" is the combined T_C and I score on the Personal Orientation Inventory. This is symbolically represented as $T_C + I$.
5. Student Perception of the Guidance Program: For the purposes of this study, the operational definition of "student perception of the guidance program" is the scores on Categories A_1; A_{2-7}; B; D; and E and the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4.

Limitations

1. The counselors who participated in this study do not represent a truly random sample. All participants were volunteers. There

was no way of knowing how the volunteers differed from those who were invited to participate but declined.

2. In most schools which participated, some of the students attended an area vocational school. To this extent, the sample of students was biased in that vocational students were not surveyed.
3. This study was limited in that the Personal Orientation Inventory, the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey and the Personal Information Form are imperfect instruments.
4. This study was limited in that there is a margin of error implicit in the use of inferential statistics.
5. This study was limited in that the counselors who participated were employed in rural high schools in Ohio and this has imposed certain restraints on the ability to generalize the results to a broader population.

Delimitations

1. In an attempt at minimizing intra-counselor contamination or bias, only those schools which reported no more than one full-time and one half-time counselor were considered for this study. Consequently, these schools were generally located in rural communities in Ohio.
2. No attempt was made to correlate the sex of the counselor with student perception of the guidance program.
3. No attempt was made to correlate years of counseling experience with student perception of the guidance program.

4. No attempt was made to correlate the number of selected professional memberships held by the counselor with student perception of the guidance program.
5. No attempt was made to identify counselor age.
6. No attempt was made to control for prior student contact with any guidance program or guidance counselor other than the program and counselor under investigation.
7. No attempt was made to control for or identify the nature or type of guidance program or the manner in which it was implemented in each school.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

The writer was concerned with the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the entire guidance program. In previous field studies, samples have often been limited to only those students who received direct service from their counselor rather than to all of the students for whom the counselor was responsible (Form, 1953; Jenson, 1955; McClain, 1968b). The counselors who have participated in many of the previous investigations of counselor personality have generally been practicum students or fully trained counselors employed in a college setting as opposed to secondary school counselors working in the field at the time of the particular study (Jackson & Thompson, 1971).

The sample for the writer's investigation included secondary school counselors who were employed in the field during the time of this study. Students were surveyed as to their perceptions of the entire range of school guidance activities regardless of whether or not they had received individual counseling. At the present time there is limited research which is directly related to the topic of the writer's investigation. The review of the literature which follows relied in part upon studies conducted with counselors-in-training as well as studies which surveyed only those students who received individual counseling.

Counselor personality has been investigated by a variety of methods and approaches over the past twenty-five years. The emphasis of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1964, 1966), which is used in the writer's study, is the measurement of psychological health. The Personal Orientation Inventory is largely based on Maslow's concept of self-actualization.

Maslow (1962) saw the self-actualized individual as fully functioning, psychologically healthy and possessing the attributes of acceptance, spontaneity, autonomy and creativeness. The Personal Orientation Inventory has been widely used in measuring the degree of psychological health of counselors in numerous investigations.

In the first section, counselor personality studies are reviewed. The review provides some insight into counselor personality as it relates to the perceptions of peer, client and supervisor ratings. This section also includes a review of studies which have used the Personal Orientation Inventory which is also referred to as the POI. The second section contains a review of studies dealing with students as a source of input. The last section summarizes the review of the literature.

Counselor Personality

There is a growing body of research concerning counselor personality characteristics by psychologists and counselor-educators. Many of the studies have attempted to correlate counselor personality characteristics with counselor success. The instrumentation and criterion of counselor success have differed from study to study. Each researcher has tried to identify those characteristics which are associated with what he considered to be effective or successful counseling. Yet a single criterion of counselor effectiveness or success has not been established. One instrument which has been used in a number of studies where counselor personality has been investigated is the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire which is also referred to as the 16 PF.

McClain (1968b) in a study using the 16 PF hypothesized that the desirable personality characteristics for counselors differ according to the counselor's sex. For this reason he computed separate coefficients of correlations between 16 PF scores and supervisors' ratings for men and women. The subjects were NDEA Guidance Institute students most of whom were employed as secondary school counselors at the time the study was conducted. According to McClain (1968b:496) counselor success was determined by supervisor ratings which were based "only on performance in the face-to-face counseling situations." Each counselor was then assigned a rating of excellent, average or poor. Each counselor was also administered the 16 PF while he was in attendance at the institute. The 16 PF scores and supervisor ratings were collected over a five year period.

McClain (1968b:492) contended that: (a) a single standardized personality instrument can be useful in distinguishing between successful and unsuccessful counselors, and (b) "the measurable characteristics necessary for success are different for men and women." McClain's findings suggest that successful male counselors and successful female counselors can be differentiated according to their scoring in opposite directions on five factors of the 16 PF. Successful male counselors as compared to unsuccessful male counselors are identified as "more outgoing, assertive, happy-go-lucky, venturesome and liberal." Successful female counselors as compared to unsuccessful female counselors are "characterized as more humble, sober, shy, conservative and reserved." McClain noted that the successful counselors seem to fit the popular stereotypes of masculinity and femininity for their respective sexes.

Donnan, Harlan and Thompson (1969) also used the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire in their study. The subjects in the Donnan, Harlan and Thompson study were experienced counselors who were working in a college setting. The 16 PF scores were correlated with a client completed relationship inventory which measured (a) unconditional positive regard; (b) empathic understanding, (c) self-congruence and (d) trust. The results indicate a positive correlation between unconditional positive regard and Factor A of the 16 PF. A high score on Factor A is labeled outgoing, warm-hearted while a low score is labeled reserved. According to the criterion of the Donnan, Harlan and Thompson (1969) study a high score on Factor A (outgoing, warmhearted) identified successful counselors of both sexes. This result contradicts some of McClain's (1968b) conclusions.

In the McClain (1968b) study, cited above, successful male counselors were identified as being high on Factor A (outgoing, warmhearted) and successful female counselors were characterized as being low on Factor A (reserved). A successful female counselor in the Donnan, Harlan and Thompson (1969) study would have scored high on Factor A, thereby being identified as outgoing and warmhearted. According to Factor A of the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire, the characteristics of a successful female counselor in the Donnan, Harlan and Thompson study are the opposite of the characteristics of a successful female counselor in the McClain study. Yet both investigations found that Factor A was significantly correlated to the specific researchers' criterion of counselor success. Not only did the criterion of counselor success differ but so too did the setting. The counselors in the Donnan, Harlan and Thompson study worked in a college setting whereas those who participated in the McClain study were employed in secondary schools. These differences could account for the conflicting results. As Cottle (1953:445) suggested:

> Any attempt at identification of personal characteristics of counselors needs to consider those characteristics which are essential for effective service at each level of counseling and each kind of counseling. . . . It seems necessary to identify clearly each area and level of counseling because it is not apparent whether characteristics of counselors in each area and at each level within an area are the same or different. That is, it is not clear whether the same characteristics are required for each successful counselor in educational institutions whether in elementary schools, secondary schools, or in college counseling bureaus.

Jackson and Thompson (1971) like McClain (1968b) used NDEA Institute students as subjects for their investigation which correlated counselor sex and effectiveness as rated by supervisors with: (a) cognitive flexibility; (b) tolerance of ambiguity; and (c) attitudes towards self, most people, most clients and counseling. The counselors were identified as either "effective" or "least effective" on the basis of their supervisors' ratings in practicum while they were in attendance at the institute.

Between one and five years had elapsed since each participant had attended the institute when Jackson and Thompson implemented the follow-up phase of their investigation. Each former participant was mailed three instruments which measured: (a) cognitive flexibility (two case studies by Whiteley); (b) tolerance of ambiguity (Hanson's modified version of Budner's Intolerance-Tolerance for Ambiguity Scale); and (c) counseling related attitudes (a semantic differential by Osgood). The results indicated that (Jackson & Thompson, 1971:252):

> 1. . . . effective counselors are more cognitively flexible and tolerant of ambiguity than ineffective counselors, male and female counselors also were not differentiated on these two dimensions.
>
> 2. . . . The most effective counselors were more positive than the least effective counselors in their attitudes towards _self_, _most clients_ and _counselors_.
>
> 3. As a group the female counselors were more positive than the male counselors in their attitudes.
>
> 4. Effective counselors and all female counselors viewed the self as more identified than unidentified, enough rather than not enough, and revealing rather than unrevealing.
>
> 5. The most effective counselors were more positive in viewing _most people_ and _most clients_ as friendly, able, and worthy, while viewing _counseling_ as freeing, altruistic and important.
>
> 6. . . . The concepts differentiating the two counselor groups most significantly were counselor attitudes towards _most people_ and _most clients_.

The Jackson and Thompson (1971) investigation was a quasi-field study in that counselor effectiveness was rated at the time the subjects were enrolled in an NDEA Guidance Institute and were not fully employed counselors. At the time of the follow-up most of the subjects were fully employed and experienced counselors working in secondary schools. It would be virtually impossible to replicate the Jackson and Thompson study (1971). Nevertheless, it is one of the few studies conducted, at least in part, with experienced counselors who, at the time of the follow-up were working in the field.

A number of investigators have administered the _Personal Orientation Inventory_ (Shostrom, 1966) to counselors working in the field, counselors-in-training, and resident hall assistants. The following studies reflect the mixed results found using the POI. Dormitory assistants' effectiveness, as measured by a semantic differential instrument were correlated with their POI scores in a study conducted by Graff and Bradshaw (1970). In the beginning of the spring 1969 quarter, seventy-one dormitory assistants, all of whom were undergraduates, were administered the POI. At the end of the quarter the students on each floor were asked to rate their dormitory assistants. Approximately eighty-five percent (85%) or 2,963 students responded. Students' ratings as well as the ratings of those deans associated with the administration of the dormitories were correlated with the POI score for each dormitory assistant.

The semantic differential questionnaire which was used to rate dormitory assistant effectiveness consisted of six areas: (a) order and discipline; (b) quasi-counseling and guidance; (c) model role; (d) referral agent; (e) leadership in educational and social activities; and (f) identification of problems. These six areas were considered primary roles or functions of the dormitory assistants. According to Graff and Bradshaw (1970:503) the questionnaire which they developed for use in their study was "adapted from questionnaires by Gonyea and Warman (1962) and Hoyt and Davidson (1967)."

Graff and Bradshaw (1970:504) indicated that the:

> Inner-Directed, Self-Actualizing Value, Spontaneity and Acceptance of Aggression were the primary scales of the POI which predicted effectiveness in the diverse role of the dormitory assistants when using student ratings.

In addition to the four POI scales listed above, Capacity for Intimate Contact and Self-Acceptance were the primary predictors when the deans' ratings were used. Graff and Bradshaw (1970:504) concluded that: "The results suggest that the POI may have practical value as a tool in the selection of dormitory assistants." The Graff and Bradshaw (1970) study was unusual in that all students were invited to evaluate their dormitory assistants regardless of the degree or type of service the students received.

Foulds (1969b) also used the POI in his investigation into the relationship between positive mental health with facilitative genuineness during counseling. Thirty graduate students enrolled in a graduate program in counseling and guidance were administered the POI at the beginning of their first practicum. Recorded samples of their interviewing were randomly selected and rated by two judges according to Carkhuff's scales for measuring facilitative genuineness. Students were assigned to either a "high" or "low" group based on their ability to offer facilitative genuineness within a counseling relationship. Only the top twenty-seven percent and the bottom twenty-seven percent of the students' scores were used in the ensuing correlational computations with the POI.

Foulds' (1969b:764) results suggested that "seven of the twelve scales of the POI and the combined Time Competence and Inner Direction scales significantly differentiate between the two groups of subjects." The high group scored significantly higher on (a) Inner-Directed; (b) Self-Actualizing Values; (c) Existentiality; (d) Feeling Reactivity; (e) Self-Acceptance; (f) Acceptance of Aggression; and (g) Capacity for Intimate Contact. Because counselors-in-training were used as subjects, Foulds (1969b:765) advised that

". . . additional research is required, however to determine if these findings hold for experienced counselors."

Three years after the Foulds (1969b) study, Winborn and Rowe's (1972) replication was published. The only major methodological change in design was that in the replication there were fifty counselors-in-training whereas in the original study there were only thirty. However, Winborn and Rowe (1972:28-29) found a 0.00 correlation coefficient between the summed scores of Time Competent and Inner-Directed with total facilitative conditions as measured by the Carkhuff scales. In making reference to their replication, Winborn and Rowe (1972:28-29) concluded that "The findings of this study make suspect Foulds' interpretation that there is a direct relationship between counselor self-actualization and ability to provide facilitative conditions."

Pellegreno (1968) investigated the relationship between counselor personal constructs with counselor effectiveness. Self-actualization as measured by the POI and semantic habits as measured by the Semantic Association Test were the two personal constructs which were correlated with supervisor and peer rating of counselor effectiveness. Counselor effectiveness was determined by faculty and peer ranking of the ten "potentially most effective" and the ten "potentially least effective" counselors of the thirty participants in the NDEA Guidance Institute. Pellegreno found no significant correlations between any of the scales of the POI or the Semantic Association Test with supervisor or peer rating of counselor effectiveness. Pellegreno (1968;66) suggested that ". . . it tends to appear that the high standards imposed during the selection of the Institute enrollees may have functioned as a limiting factor."

Eiben (1968:796-A) attempted to ". . . determine if the personal orientation of the school counselor and his counselees significantly influenced the post-interview affect of the interview participants." The *POI* was administered to twenty-four secondary school counselors. Adaptations of Snyder's Post-Interview Scales were administered to the twenty-four counselors and forty-eight counselees. Among Eiben's (1968:796-A) findings were:

> There was no significant difference in total post-interview affect, counselor post-interview affect and counselee post-interview affect among the four high and low counselor-counselee groups categorized on the basis of scores on the *Personal Orientation Inventory*.
>
> There was no significant difference between the obtained correlation coefficients for high personal oriented and low personal oriented counselors.

In summary, Eiben (1968:796-A) ". . . assumed that the instruments utilized are applicable for work with secondary school counselors and their counselees."

In conclusion, Winborn and Rowe (1972), Pellegreno (1968), and Eiben (1968) found no significant correlations with any variables under investigation in their respective studies with the *POI*. On the other hand, the Foulds (1969b), McClain (1970) and Graff and Bradshaw (1970) studies found between four and nine scales of the *POI* to be significant. All three of these studies found Inner-Direction (I), Self-Actualized Values (SAV) and Spontaneity (S) to be significant. Even though Pellegreno (1968) and Eiben (1968) found no significant correlations in their respective studies, both recommended further research with the *POI* or similar instruments.

Students as a Source of Input

The merits of using students as a source of input for either teacher or counselor evaluation have been strongly debated in the literature (Gladstein, 1969; Jenson, 1955; Severinsen, 1966; Stefflre, King & Leafgren, 1962; Veldman & Peck, 1969; Wharton, 1968). The issue remains unresolved. Counseling research has been limited largely to surveying only those students who received direct service from the counselor. Among those who feel that students are an ideal source of input are Veldman and Peck whose writings have primarily dealt with student perceptions of the classroom teacher. Veldman and Peck (1963:346-347) contended:

> 1. One of the weaknesses inherent in most studies involving the use of trained observers is the limited sample of actually observed behaviors . . . upon which the assessments must be based. Adequate evaluation demands an adequate sample of observed performance in the wide variety of roles demanded of the modern teacher.
>
> 2. A single hour of classroom observation seldom provides sufficient evidence for an observer to evaluate the full range of attributes of interest to investigators.
>
> 3. . . . pupils have one major advantage over other observers: they see the teacher perform on many different occasions, as she encounters a wide variety of problems, as she attempts quite varied tasks, and as she deals with individuals known personally to the observer.
>
> 4. Not only does each pupil have the advantage of many separate observations upon which to base his judgment, the use of pupils as observers also affords the increased reliability and reduction of bias that multiple judges afford.

There is strong criticism of such a position. Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962:335) in commenting about the use of clients or students as judges suggested that: "An obvious weakness of this method is that any one client or student would not have had experience with many counselors and so would be handicapped in making normative judgments."

Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) were probably accurate to the extent that any given student would likely have contact with one or maybe two counselors and, therefore, be unable to make normative judgments. But whether a student can base his judgments upon one or several counselors is not the issue. What matters is whether he has a positive view towards a given counselor in particular. Unless a student views counseling in a positive manner, it is doubtful that he will take advantage of it. Goodstein and Grigg (1959:20) suggested:

> Successful counselors, not unlike other professionals in law or medicine, are evaluated not only by emperical measures but also by the demands for their services. Client dissatisfaction can only lead to distorted perception of the effectiveness of counseling with a consequent reduction in the social effectiveness of counseling. Clients who are dissatisfied with their counseling experience will not, in all probability regard counseling as a useful procedure regardless of whether or not they have actually been helped by the process.

Students have been used as a source of input in a number of studies by investigators working in a number of different settings. McQuary (1964:145) asked 116 graduate students enrolled in their first course in guidance to identify the "characteristics they would prefer if they were counselees." The data reported by McQuary were collected over several semesters. The participants in the McQuary study included housewives, nurses, teachers, administrators and others at all educational levels. The results indicated that "understanding," "adequate professional training" and "one who keeps a confidence" ranked first, second and third respectively. McQuary's study was of particular interest since the data source was not limited to counselor-educators or administrators but a broader sampling of those in attendance in graduate school. To some extent, the respondents were potential consumers of the counseling service.

In another study which used potential consumers of counseling services, Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) asked forty NDEA Guidance Institute members to evaluate their peers. The criterion of counselor effectiveness was peer judgment. The students were asked (Stefflre, King & Leafgren, 1962:336) ". . . to indicate the extent to which you would be apt to go to the various members of the Institute for counseling if you were a student in a school where they were working as a counselor." Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) were unable to determine how the good counselors differed from the poor ones but suggested that possibly the students received input from faculty members throughout the NDEA Guidance Institute about which counselors the faculty felt were good. According to Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962:339-340):

> The most clearcut and significant finding is that counselors are able to agree to a remarkably high extent on which of their fellows they believe would be good counselors and which would be poor ones. The stuff that goes into such an opinion is harder to discover, and the critical incident technique failed to reveal it. The basic Q sort, however, seems to lend itself to research of this type and may merit further use.
>
> The nine 'most chosen' participants were compared on a number of variables with the nine 'least chosen.' Most chosen participants had (a) higher academic performance, (b) somewhat more appropriate Strong scores, (c) less dogmatism (Rokeach). The two groups did not differ on the other variables studied.

In both the Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) and McQuary (1964) investigations the participants were asked, in effect, to role play potential clients when in reality they were graduate students in education.

The university setting has been extensively used for research dealing with counselor personality and client perception of counseling because of its built-in availability of subjects. There has been a limited amount of field research where the subjects who participated in the investigation were currently employed school counselors and their students. A limited number of studies have been conducted in cooperation with school officials and counselors where the research was conducted within an elementary or secondary school setting.

In a study conducted by Wortman (1969) the sample consisted of 170 fifth grade students distributed across five different communities which employed a counselor in their elementary school. The following questions were among those that Wortman (1969:145-A) investigated:

> 1. Who do children most desire for helpers in meeting needs that children perceive as unmet?
>
> 2. What kind of helping behaviors do they perceive as desirable?
>
> 3. What kind of person is seen as the best helper?

A specially structured instrument was administered to the fifth grade students to measure the relevance between student concerns and their counselors' skills. An adapted version of the SRA Junior Inventory, a check list of twenty-five helping behaviors and a personal characteristics profile with differential type items were used to obtain data on needs, helpers and helping behaviors. Wortman's (1969: 145-146-A) results indicated that:

> 1. . . . the most often mentioned concerns . . . were grades, passing and being smarter in school.
>
> 2. In rank order from most to least desirable, the most often chosen helpers were mother, teacher, father, and peers.

Out of ten categories of helpers, the overall rank of the counselor was seven.

3. The correlation between the kinds of helps desired by the subjects and the kinds they expected the counselor to perform were not significant.

4. Among the helps most expected from the counselor were:

    (a) Talking with me about my problems.
    (b) Finding out what is really happening when I have trouble with other people.
    (c) Asking me for some of my ideas and listening to me.
    (d) Helping me to believe that I can do what needs to be done.
    (e) Talking to those who are important to me so they understand me better.

Wortman also found that students preferred the helper to be empathic and that the counselors tended to be rated lower on empathy than congruence, unconditional positive regard, fairness, appropriate communication, autonomy, competency, trust and emotional stability. In Wortman's opinion the students' view of the role and function of the counselor tended to parallel the views held by professionals in the field of guidance and counselor education. Wortman recommended (1969:146-A) that:

> . . . the counselor needs to structure his visibility so that he is perceived as adequate in social and personal value and power, in relationship behaviors, and in desirable personal characteristic.

Whereas Wortman (1969) surveyed elementary school students, Tipton (1969) surveyed 209 students from two public secondary schools. Tipton (1969:3805-A) sought to identify and examine the ". . . attitudes of high school students towards guidance counselors in their performance of educational, vocational, and personal counseling" by asking students to ". . . rank in order of importance those persons or things which they considered to have most influenced their attitudes towards counselors." The instrument used to measure student attitudes consisted of five sketches which pertained to the various kinds of counseling under investigation to which the students provided free responses.

Based on the results of her study, Tipton (1969:3805-3806-A) concluded that:

1. Students prefer voluntary counseling to nonvoluntary counseling, and are more likely to express favorable attitudes toward voluntary counseling.

2. Although students tend to express favorable attitudes toward both educational and vocational counseling, more students view educational counseling favorably. Only about one third of the students in this sample expressed a willingness to approach the counselor for help on a personal problem.

3. Peer groups form the major source of influencing attitudes toward counselors, and this influence tends to be negative. Parent, teacher, and other adult influence is minimal but positive. Counselors themselves do not appear to have much influence on student attitudes toward counselors.

4. Frequent student-counselor contacts tend to promote favorable attitudes toward educational, vocational, and personal counseling when these contacts are voluntary on the part of the student.

5. Girls are more likely than boys to express favorable attitudes toward vocational counseling; non-college preparatory students are more likely than college preparatory students to express favorable attitudes toward voluntary educational and vocational counseling; and students who do not plan to attend a four-year college are more likely than those who do to express favorable attitudes toward nonvoluntary educational counseling.

In both the Tipton (1969) and Wortman (1969) studies, students were surveyed regardless of whether or not they had received direct service from their counselor. Jenson (1955) also surveyed high school students but his random sample of 1600 students included only those ". . . who had 'talked' with the counselors." The questionnaire (Jenson, 1955:500), which was based on district wide counseling objectives, covered five general areas and asked the students to: (a) evaluate the quality of the help they received from the counselors, and (b) identify the person or persons most likely to be of help in these five areas. The areas investigated were:

1. Better understanding of abilities, interests, ambitions, and personality.
2. Discovery of things best suited to do or be happiest doing both while in school and after finishing school.
3. Making progress toward realistically chosen while-in-school and after-school goals.
4. Learning to get along better with friends and others at school, at home, or in the community.
5. Increasing capacity and self-confidence in making decisions and solving adjustment problems both now and in the future.

Jenson (1955:498) believed that ". . . consumer reaction determines the destiny of most, if not all, professional service." The data from the Jenson study were used in evaluating the district's counseling program. The results indicated that: (a) eighty-one percent of the students felt that they received help in area A (better understanding of abilities, interests, ambitions and personality), (b) approximately sixty-three percent of the students felt that the counselors were of help in the four remaining areas, B, C, D, and E, (c) between twenty-seven percent and thirty-eight percent of the students, depending on the area, selected the counselor as the first person from whom they would seek help, (d) counselors and parents tended to receive equal rankings for being the first person from whom the students would seek help.

A major contribution of the Jenson study was its design. It presented the objectives of the counseling program in the form of a questionnaire and asked those students who received counseling to evaluate the program. The Jenson (1955) and Wortman (1969) studies were similar in that both asked students to rank those individuals who had been sources of help. Jenson's sample included students in grades nine through twelve whereas Wortman's included fifth grade students only.

In conclusion, students have been used as a source of input in various investigations of client satisfaction, counseling program success, and counselor effectiveness. The conceptual legitimacy of using consumers of a service to evaluate that with which they have had little experience remains unresolved. Most studies have relied upon surveying only those students who received counseling. Tipton (1969) and Wortman (1969) surveyed students without regard to whether or not the students received counseling. The advantage of surveying both clients and non-clients is that it can provide the counselor with information about the attitudes of a representative sample of all those for whom the guidance counselor is responsible. The counseling function has been more frequently evaluated by students than has the broad spectrum of guidance services.

Summary

The writer's purpose is to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actuaization and student perception of the guidance program. Numerous studies have dealt with counselor personality yet the results have been largely inconclusive. Many of the early attempts at identifying those characteristics which were considered essential to the ideal counselor were developed by seeking the opinions of members of various professional groups (Cottle, 1953; Hill & Green, 1960). Recent advances in the techniques of the assessment of personality have had a major impact upon research design. Some of the newer instruments are based upon particular personality constructs. Self-actualization is an example of one such construct.

Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory is largely based upon Maslow's writings on self-actualization. The POI has been used with mixed results in the measurement of the level of counselor self-actualization in studies by Eiben (1968), Foulds (1969b), Graff and Bradshaw (1970), McClain (1970), Pellegreno (1968) and Winborn and Rowe (1972).

In many of the studies cited above the results of the POI were correlated with either supervisor or peer rating of counselor interview behavior. In none of the studies reported by this writer were the Personal Orientation Inventory scores correlated with student perception of the guidance program. Much of the research which has been conducted in the past has been limited to the use of only those students who received direct service from the counselor as opposed to all students for whom the counselor is responsible.

Stefflre, King and Leafgren (1962) contend that students by virtue of their inexperience with counseling and their age are in no position to evaluate the quality of the counseling which they have received. On the other hand, Goodstein and Grigg (1959) felt that client satisfaction was an area worthy of additional research.

Jenson (1955:498) believed that "consumer reaction" to counseling was an issue with which counselors in the field should be concerned.

In conclusion, there seems to be a wealth of studies which have correlated the results of counselor-completed personality instruments with supervisor or client rating of the counseling relationship or client satisfaction. There have also been several recent studies which have surveyed student attitudes toward counseling in particular and guidance programs in general. Most of the research which deals with counselor personality has been conducted in a university setting. There is a limited amount of research which deals with counselor personality which has been conducted in the field.

To some extent, both counselor personality and student perception of the guidance program have been investigated separately. There appears to be virtually no research which has correlated counselor personality with student perception of the guidance program. It is, therefore, appropriate and necessary to investigate the relationship between counselor personality and student perception of the guidance program. This investigation will attempt to answer the question: What is the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program?

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by a selected index of the Personal Orientation Inventory and student perception of the guidance program as measured by the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4. The Personal Orientation Inventory will also be referred to as the POI and the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey will also be referred to as the GPES. Both the level of self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program will be measured by objective instruments.

This study was conducted in the fall of 1971. The counselors who were invited to participate were initially selected on the basis of their schools' geographic proximity to Toledo, Ohio. This was accomplished through the use of selected telephone area codes which are within 125 miles of Toledo and within the state of Ohio. The counselors were selected on the basis of the telephone area code of their schools as listed in the Directory of Ohio School Counselors (Frericks, 1970). In order to qualify for participation in this study, each counselor must have been employed in a school which had at least one three-quarters time counselor and no more than one full-time and one half-time counselor. A superficial scanning of the Directory of Ohio School Counselors (Frericks, 1970) indicated that most of the schools were the only high schools in their districts and they tended to be in rural communities.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

The Directory of Ohio School Counselors (Frericks, 1970) included 114 schools which (a) listed the name of one counselor as being employed in their high school and (b) were located within 125 miles of Toledo and within the State of Ohio. In August of 1971 letters were sent to all 114 counselors which described the proposed study and asked them to indicate their interest in participating. (See Appendix A.) A copy of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey was included for their inspection. (See Appendix B.) Of the sixty-one replies, thirty-five counselors indicated an interest in participating. The purpose of this first mailing was to establish the feasibility of this particular research design.

The second mailing, which was sent to the thirty-five counselors who indicated an interest, requested the counselor to agree to participate in this study and obtain from his principal written permission to administer the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey to his students enrolled in the eleventh grade. (See Appendix C.) Ultimately twenty-four counselors agreed to participate and received their principal's permission. Twenty-three counselors constituted the final sample for this study since one counselor did not complete the administration of the student surveys.

Each counselor completed the Personal Information Form which was a questionnaire designed by this writer for the purposes of this study. (See Appendix D.) The information obtained was of a demographic nature and is summarized in the tables below.

Table 1

Counselor Sex

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	16	69.56
Female	7	30.44

Table 2

Counselor Certification in the State of Ohio

Certification	Number	Percent
Certified	20	86.96
Not Certified	3	13.04

Table 3

Years Experience as a Counselor

Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
5.00	3.41	1-13

Counselors were asked to report the name of professional organizations to which they belonged. Those professional organizations which were considered by this writer to be related to the counseling profession and the number of memberships reported appears in Table 4.

Table 4

Counselor Reported Memberships in Selected Professional Organizations Related to Counseling

Organizations	Number	Percent
American Personnel and Guidance Association	6	26.08
Ohio School Counselors Association	17	73.91
Local or Regional School Counselors Association	12	52.17

Many counselors belonged to more than one professional organization which is related to counseling. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Total Number of Memberships Held in Any or All of the Following Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance Association; Ohio School Counselors Association; or a Local or Regional School Counselors Organization

Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
1.47	.79	1-3

The students in the twenty-three participating schools were all enrolled in grade eleven. Those students who normally attended an area vocational or technical school or were absent on the day the GPES was administered were not included in the sample. The GPES includes two verification items which are designed to discriminate between those students who have taken seriously the task of completing the GPES and those students who may have randomly filled in the spaces. The final sample included the surveys of only those students who supplied the preferred response to both verification items. This study was based upon a sample of 1,658 students.

Table 6

Student Response to GPES Verification Items Upon which the Final Sample for this Study Was Based

Response	Number	Percent
Preferred	1,658	87.36
Non-Preferred	240	12.64

The sizes of the schools varied considerably. The following information is based upon the enrollment of students in grade eleven only who were administered the GPES and provided the preferred response to both verification items.

Table 7

Number of Grade Eleven Students in Each School Whose Surveys Constituted the Sample Used in this Study

Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
72.08	28.72	37-138

INSTRUMENTATION

Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1966) was selected for this investigation because it measures mental health in a positive sense as opposed to a more traditional and pathologically oriented instrument like the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Furthermore, the nature of the items in the POI are such that they would unlikely have been viewed by the counselors as offensive or prying. Since the cooperation of the counselors was essential to the completion of this writer's study, it was felt that care should be taken in the selection of an instrument which would not alienate the counselors.

The Personal Orientation Inventory which was developed by Shostrom (1964, 1966) is conceptually related to Maslow's writings on self-actualization as well as humanistic, existentialist and Gestalt psychology. Test-retest reliability as well as content and concurrent validity have been reported by Ilardi & May (1968), Knapp (1971), McClain (1970) and Shostrom (1964, 1966). According to Pellegreno (1968) reliability and validity indices for the POI are within the same range as similar instruments. According to Shostrom (1966:5):

> The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) consists of 150 two-choice comparative value and behavior judgments. The items are scored twice, first for two basic scales of personal orientation, inner directed support (127 items) and time competence (23 items) and second for ten subscales each of which measures a conceptually important element of self-actualization.
>
> In recent years, Maslow (1954, 1962) has developed the idea of the self-actualizing person--a person who is more fully functioning and lives a more enriched life than does the average person. Such an individual is seen as developing and utilizing all of his unique capabilities, or potentialities, free of the inhibitions and emotional turmoil of those less self-actualized.

The two basic scales can be reported in terms of either raw scores or ratios. The use of ratios are helpful when the POI is used in a counseling setting. Shostrom (1966:7) suggested that:

> For correlational or other statistical analyses it is recommended that scores from the Time Competence scale and the Inner-Directed scale be used in preference to the ratio scores, due to the statistical complexities of ratio scores.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, this writer decided to report the results of the POI in raw scores only. In several recent studies where the POI has been used, the two basic scales (Time Competent and Inner-Directed) have been combined to yield a single index of self-actualization (Foulds, 1967; Winborn & Rowe, 1972). Damn (1969:981) suggested that "an overall measure of the POI can probably be best obtained by using the raw score of the I scale or by combining the raw scores of the I and T_C Scales." Knapp (1971:13) contended that the "highest average correlation between the overall indices studied and the POI scales was obtained by using a simple combination of raw scores from the I and T_C scales." Murray (1968:33) tested the hypotheses in her dissertation by "adding the Time Competence score and Inner Direction score...to indicate present level of self-actualization." For purposes of hypothesis testing, this writer has decided to use the combined Time Competent (T_C) and Inner Directed (I) score as a single index of level of counselor self-actualization.

The scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom 1966: 15-21) are described below. The two basic scales, Time Competent (T_C) and Inner-Directed (I) are described first and second respectively. The ten subscales are described thereafter.

1. T_C- Time Competence:

> The self-actualized person is primarily Time-Competent and thus appears to live more fully in the here and now. He is able to tie the past and the future to the present in a meaningful continuity. He appears to be less burdened by guilts, regrets, and resentments from the past than is the

non-self-actualized person, and his aspirations are tied meaningfully to present working goals. He has faith in the future without rigid or over-idealistic goals. ...The self-actualized individuals past and future orientations are depicted as reflecting positive mental health to the extent that his past is used for reflective thought and the future is tied to present goals.

2. I- Inner-Directed:

The inner-directed person appears to have incorporated a psychic 'gyroscope' which is started by parental influences and later on is further influenced by other authority figures. The inner-directed man goes through life apparently independent, but still obeying this internal piloting. The source of inner-direction seems to be implanted early in life and the direction is guided by a small number of principles. The source of direction for the individual is inner in the sense that he is guided by internal motivations rather than external influences. The source of direction becomes generalized as an inner core of principles and character traits.

3. SAV- Self-Actualizing Values:

SAV...was derived from Maslow's concept of self-actualizing people. A high score means that the individual holds and lives by the values of self-actualizing people, and a low score means he rejects values of self-actualizing people. Items in this scale cut across many characteristics but a representative item is 38, 'I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.'

4. Ex- Existentiality:

...the Existentiality scale measures one's flexibility in applying such values or principles to one's life. It is a measure of one's ability to use good judgment in applying these general principles. Higher scores reflect flexibility in application of values. People who get low scores tend to hold values so rigidly that they may become compulsive or dogmatic.

5. Fr- Feeling Reactivity:

A high score measures sensitivity to one's own needs and feelings. A low score shows insensitivity to one's own needs and feelings.

6. S- Spontaneity:

A high score measures the ability to express feelings in spontaneous action. A low score indicates that one is fearful of expressing feelings behaviorally.

7. Sr- Self-Regard:

A high score measures the ability to like one's self because of one's strength as a person. A low score indicates low self-worth.

8. Sa- Self-Acceptance:

A high score measures acceptance of one's self in spite of one's weaknesses or deficiences. A low score indicates inability to accept one's weaknesses. It is more difficult to achieve self-acceptance than self-regard. Self-actualization requires both.

9. Nc- Nature of Man, Constructive:

A high score means that one sees man as essentially good. He can resolve the goodness-evil, masculine-femine, selfishness-unselfishness and spirituality-sensualities dichotomies in the nature of man. A high score, therefore, measures the self-actualizing ability to be synergic in understanding of human nature. A low score means that one sees man as essentially evil or bad and is not synergistic.

10. Sy- Synergy:

A high score is a measure of the ability to see opposites of life as meaningfully related. A low score means that one sees opposites of life as antagonistic. When one is synergistic one sees that work and play are not different, that lust and love, selfishness and selflessness and other dichotomies are not really opposites at all.

11. A- Acceptance:

A high score measures the ability to accept anger and aggression within one's self as natural. A low score means that one denies having such feelings.

12. C- Capacity for Intimate Contact:

A high score measures the person's ability to develop meaningful, contactful relationships with other human beings. A low score means one has difficulty with warm inter-personal relationships. Making contact may be defined as the ability to develop and maintain an 'I-Thou' relationship in the here and now and the ability to meaningfully touch another human being. We know that intimate contacts seem to be encumbered by expectations and obligations. Thus, it can be said that the climate to establish good contact is best when the individual

> does not over-respond to, nor does he utilize, interpersonal demand expectations and obligations. Other measured dimensions which facilitate contact are the ability to express vs. impress, being vs. pleasing, and the ability to relate intensely to another person either aggressively or tenderly.

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES). The original version of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey was developed by H. Eugene Wysong (1968) as part of his doctoral dissertation. The instrument used in this study is a revised version and is dated November, 1971. It has been labeled Form A-4. The rationale for the revisions was essentially the same as that developed for the first edition which is explained in Wysong's dissertation. The following discussion of the rationale and development of the instrument is based upon that dissertation. The description of the instrument to be employed in this study, Form A-4, is based upon this writer's analysis of this latest revision since there are virtually no published or unpublished materials available at this time.

According to Wysong (1968:16):

> The only justification for the existence of a school guidance program is through what it does to benefit students. Guidance services are not devised just for the sake of mere existence, but rather, for the purpose of aiding students to achieve certain worthwhile objectives. ...The objective of a guidance program should be described in terms of student behavior rather than in such terms which explain counselor function.

Consequently, the first step was to develop a taxonomy of those objectives which a total guidance program should help students accomplish. The ensuing taxonomy was based on Bloom's *A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I, The Cognitive*

Domain and Krathwohl's A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II, The Affective Domain. The Taxonomy of Guidance Objectives, developed by Wysong (1968:2), was "validated through the judgment of five guidance experts."

The GPES is an inventory based on Wysong's Taxonomy of Guidance Objectives and is designed to measure the attainment of the guidance objectives by students. These guidance objectives, as defined by Wysong (1968:12) are "objectives toward which the guidance program intends to assist student progress." Wysong (1968) includes the following list of services a guidance program offers:

1. student counseling
2. staff consultation
3. parent consultation
4. group guidance instruction
5. student information
6. guidance information
7. guidance resources
8. guidance research and evaluation

Form A-4 of the GPES (Wysong, 1969a) contains 105 multiple choice questions. Two of the items (numbers 33 and 79) are verification items. The first seventy-nine items (of which both verification items are included) permit the student to respond in the following three ways: "(1) If YES is a better answer than NO;" "(2) If NO is a better answer than YES;" and "(3) If you DON'T KNOW which is better." A typical question is item number 1: "Has your counselor been of help to you?" Items 80 to 88 ask the students to identify the individual who was the most helpful in assisting him. A sample item is number 80: "Assisting you to select school subjects." The students may choose from the following alternatives for all nine items in this group: "(1) Teacher;" "(2) Counselor;" "(3) Student;" "(4) Principal;" and "(5) No One."

Items 89-95 deal with student participation, academic success and use of direct counseling services. Items 96-100 provide the students with the opportunity to evaluate various global aspects of the guidance program. A sample item is number 96: "The guidance program is:" The student may select from the following alternatives: "(1) very active;" "(2) mostly active;" "(3) in between;" "(4) mostly inactive;" and "(5) very inactive." The last five items of the GPES permit the students to rank in order of what they consider to be the most important five guidance activities. These range from assisting the students in course selection to interpersonal counseling.

The categories of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 according to Wysong (1971:6) are: (See Appendix E.)

A. Guidance Program Activities and Provisions

B. Guidance Objectives

C. Verification

D. Identification of persons in school who are regarded as the most helpful in assisting students to accomplish guidance objectives

E. Semantic Differential

F. Rating of Importance of five kinds of counselor assistance

COLLECTION OF DATA

Population

The population for this study included all senior high school counselors whose schools met the following qualifications:

1. The school was listed in the Directory of Ohio School Counselors (Frericks, 1970) as employing only one counselor during 1970-1971.
2. The school's telephone area code was 419, 513 or 614 and, therefore, within 125 miles of Toledo, Ohio and within the state of Ohio.
3. The school's principal gave the counselor written permission to survey the students enrolled in the eleventh grade using the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4.
4. Through self-report, during the 1971-1972 school year, each school employed at least one three-quarter time counselor and no more than one full-time and one half-time counselor.
5. The school and its counselor(s) qualified according to all of the above and satisfactorily completed the administration of the three instruments used in this investigation.

Instrumentation

Three objective type instruments were used in this study:

1. The Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 was administered to all eleventh grade students at each high school.
2. The Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1966) was self-administered by each counselor.
3. The Personal Information Form was completed by each counselor.

Procedures

The procedures used in obtaining a sample and implementing this investigation are as follows:

1. In September, 1971, letters were sent to all counselors whose schools qualified under conditions "1" and "2" under "Population" above which asked the counselors to indicate their interest in participating in this investigation.
2. Those counselors who indicated a willingness to participate and whose school employed at least one three-quarter time counselor and no more than one full-time and one half-time counselor during the 1971-1972 school year were sent a letter asking them to secure in writing the permission of their principal to participate in this investigation.
3. All counselors who received permission of their principal were asked to participate as long as the total number of such volunteers was equal to or exceeded twenty. Twenty was the minimum amount of participants required for statistical purposes.
4. In the last week of November, 1971, the following materials were mailed to each counselor:
    a. Directions for administering the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 and the Personal Orientation Inventory
    b. All necessary testing booklets and IBM 1230 answer sheets
    c. Postage paid pre-addressed return envelope
5. The counselors were asked to assume the responsibility for the administration of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 to all eleventh grade students who normally attended

their school. This excluded those students who normally attended an area vocational or technical school.

6. Each counselor was asked to complete the POI.
7. Each school was assigned a three digit research code number by this writer. The counselor was asked to assume the responsibility of having this number coded in on all student answer sheets in the appropriate place.
8. The counselors were requested to return the completed testing materials and booklets before January 1, 1972. Those counselors who did not return their materials satisfactorily completed by January 5, 1972 received a follow-up telephone call or letter.
9. Any materials not returned or not satisfactorily completed by March 30, 1972, were excluded from this investigation.
10. Results of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 were reported to each school in the form of percent of students responding to each item and number of students responding to each item.
11. Each counselor was given the opportunity to obtain a copy of his scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory by requesting in writing that they be sent to him.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4

1. Reliability
    a. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was used for the computation of internal reliability for each of the following Categories: A_1, A_{2-7}, B, D and E. Each category was assumed to be

homogeneous in what it measures. The reliability coefficients ranged from .52 to .74 (See Appendix F.)

b. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was not used for the computation of internal reliability for Category C (verification items) since its use is inappropriate in situations where all of the students supplied the same response to each item. Only those students who supplied the preferred response to both verification items were included in the statistical analyses of this study.

c. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was not used for the computation of internal reliability for the grand mean because the overall instrument was not assumed to be homogeneous in that it measures a wide range of school guidance objectives and activities.

d. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 is:

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)\left(\frac{S_t^2 - \Sigma pq}{S_t^2}\right)$$

2. Scoring

a. The surveys of those students who supplied the preferred response to both verification items (Category C) were scored separately from the surveys of those students who did not supply the preferred response to both verification items.

b. The surveys of those students who did not supply the preferred response to both verification items were excluded from the reliability tests and both the correlational and factor analyses.

c. Items were scored according to the preferred responses for each category and scale developed by Wysong with the following exceptions:

(1) Category A was subdivided into two categories. Items originally in Scale A-1, which was labeled Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor, were placed in Category A_1. Items in Scales A-2 to A-7 were placed in Category A_{2-7}. This change was made at Wysong's (1971c) recommendation. Wysong believed that the items in Scale A-1 as a group more closely measured some of the underlying constructs of the POI. By converting Scale A-1 to Category A_1 it was possible to correlate it along with the other categories of the GPES with the combined T_C and I score of the POI.

(2) The preferred response to items 89, 90 and 92 were the combined scores of alternatives four and five for each item respectively. These items request the student to indicate the approximate number of individual interviews he has had with his counselor and the number of school activities in which he participates. Since the GPES was administered in the beginning of the school year, it was believed appropriate to consider either alternative four, "five to seven," or alternative five, "seven or more."

(3) Item 95 was excluded from the internal reliability test, factor and correlational analyses. This item asks the student what the most important reason he has for attending school. Depending upon the individual needs of the

student, the answer would change. Wysong (1971c) believed that there could be no single preferred response identified.

(4) Category C was used as a means of separating those students who supplied the preferred response to both verification items from those who did not. Items in Category C were not used in either the internal test of reliability or the correlational analyses. Items in Category C were included in the factor analysis.

(5) For the purpose of this study, alternative two was considered the preferred response to items in Category D. Category D asks the student to identify the person most helpful to him in meeting the guidance objectives. Since this writer's investigation deals with student perception of the guidance program, it was felt that alternative two, i.e., "Counselor" was most appropriate.

(6) Items in Category F were excluded from the internal reliability test, factor and correlational analyses. The five items in this category ask the student to rank various ways in which the counselor may be of some help to him. The preferred response would depend upon the particular needs of each individual student. It was believed that this type of data would best be reported in a descriptive manner.

(7) For the purposes of this study the grand mean of the GPES was derived by computing the mean of all the categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B.

d. Scores in this study were reported in terms of percent of student supplied preferred responses for all categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B so as to accommodate the unequal number of items in each category or scale within a category.

3. Factor Analysis

   a. Only the surveys of those students who supplied the preferred response to both verification items were included in the factor analysis. (See Appendix E)

   b. Responses to individual items were converted prior to the factor analysis of the GPES into two categories for the purposes of producing a more accurate factor analysis. Any given response was identified as either the "preferred response" or "any response other than the preferred response." This second category included omissions, non-preferred responses and alternative three, "If you DON'T KNOW which is better. . ."

   c. The factor analysis used the principal axis factor extractions with a varimax rotation which is referenced in Dixon, 1971.

Personal Orientation Inventory

1. Reliability

   a. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was used for the computation of internal reliability for all 150 items combined as well as each subscale.

   b. The reliability coefficients ranged from .08 to .82. The reliability coefficient for all 150 items combined was .78. (See Appendix G.)

2. Scoring
   a. The two basic scales, T_C and I were combined for the purpose of hypothesis testing in this study.
   b. The two basic scales T_C and I, individually as well as the subscales were all scored.

Correlational Analyses

1. The following formula of the Pearson Product Moment coefficient of correlation was computed for the correlational computations in this study. $r = \dfrac{N \Sigma XY - \Sigma X \Sigma Y}{\left[N \Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2\right] \left[N \Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2\right]}$
2. The following Pearson Product Moment coefficients of correlation were computed for the purposes of hypothesis testing:
   a. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with Category A_1 of the *GPES* for all schools.
   b. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with Category A_{2-7} of the *GPES* for all schools.
   c. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with Category B of the *GPES* for all schools.
   d. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with Category D of the *GPES* for all schools.
   e. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with Category E of the *GPES* for all schools.
   f. The combined T_C and I score of the *POI* with the grand mean of the *GPES* for all schools.
3. The following Pearson Product Moment coefficients of correlation were computed for the purposes of obtaining additional data:

  a. The combined T_C and I score of the POI with each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B of the GPES.
  b. The Time Competent score of the POI with all of the categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B individually of the GPES, for all schools.
  c. The Inner-Directed score of the POI with all of the categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B individually of the GPES, for all schools.

4. A t-test to determine whether the correlation differed significantly from zero was computed with alpha set at .05 for each of the correlations cited above.

Supplementary Data

A large amount of data was collected as a result of this study which was not essential to the testing of the stated hypotheses or directly related to the reporting of the additional data. Future research may find the wealth of information generated by this study to be of some value. For this reason the following supplementary data has been reported in Appendix H.

1. The means, standard deviations and ranges, reported in raw scores for all of the scales of the POI of the twenty-three counselors who participated in this study.
2. The means, standard deviations and ranges, reported in the percent of student supplied preferred responses for all catagories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B individually of the GPES of the 1,658 students who previously supplied the preferred response to both verification items and whose surveys, therefore, were used in the correlational analyses in this study.

3. The labeled factors of the factor analysis of the _GPES_.
4. The Matrix of Pearson Product Moment coefficients of correlation between each of the _POI_ scales with each category and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B of the _GPES_. The entire matrix is presented in Appendix H although a portion of it also appears in Table 8.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program. For the purposes of hypothesis testing an overall index of counselor self-actualization was used by combining the Time Competent (T_C) and Inner-Directed (I) scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The combined score will be symbolically represented as $T_C + I$. The POI is largely based upon Maslow's view of the self-actualized individual. Maslow (1962) saw the self-actualized individual as fully functioning, psychologically healthy and possessing the attributes of acceptance, spontaneity and creativeness.

Of the total 150 items in the POI, the Time Competent scale accounts for twenty-three. The remaining 127 items constitute the Inner-Directed scale. The Time Competent individual may be characized as living in the here and now and having placed into proper perspective past experiences and future plans. The inner-directed individual may be characterized as one who has a flexible set of principles by which he lives. His behavior is guided primarily by this internalized set of principles as opposed to external influences. A complete discussion of the subscales of the POI may be found in Chapter III under "Instrumentation" or in the POI Manual (Shostrom, 1966).

Student perception of the guidance program was measured by the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES). The GPES is a survey which contains 105 multiple choice items and is based upon Wysong's Taxonomy of Guidance Objectives which is described in detail in his dissertation (1968). The GPES is designed to measure student attainment of the guidance objectives.

The results of this study will be reported for each hypothesis as follows. The supporting data required to reject or fail to reject each null hypothesis will be reported first. The significant correlations between the separate as well as the combined Time Competent and Inner-Directed scores of the Personal Orientation Inventory with all categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey will be reported second. The matrix of correlations upon which the results in this chapter are based appear in Table 8. The complete matrix of correlations between all POI scores with all categories and each of the scales comprising Categories A_{2-7} and B of the GPES is located in Appendix H.

RESULTS

Hypothesis I.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the counselor as measured by Category A_1 of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined

Table 8

Matrix of Correlations between Selected Scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory with the Categories and Scales of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey

GPES Categories and Scales	Personal Orientation Inventory Scales		
	$T_C + I$	POI Scales T_C	I
A_1	.24	.39*	.15
A-2	.10	.20	.04
A-3	.46*	.47*	.37*
A-4	.40*	.46*	.31
A-5	.12	.27	.04
A-6	.33	.45*	.24
A-7	-.12	.08	-.18
Mean A_{1-7}	.34	.50**	.23
Mean A_{2-7}	.38*	.52**	.26
B-1	.38*	.52**	.35***
B-2	.03	.09	.00
B-3	.01	.36*	-.13
B-4	-.19	.06	-.27
B-5	.08	.34	-.04
B-6	.08	.20	.02
B-7	-.08	-.01	-.10
Mean B	.10	.35***	-.02
D	.56**	.44*	.52**
E	.33	.35***	.28
Grand Mean	.35 *	.51**	.24

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

*** Not Significant at 3 decimal places

T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the counselor as measured by Category A_1 of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

All of the items in Wysong's (1971b) Category A, Scale 1 (A-1) were placed in Category A_1 in this study at the recommendation of the author who believed that these items as a group more closely measured some of the underlying constructs of the POI (Wysong, 1971c). Scale A-1 was labeled Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor. The correlation between Category A_1 of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI was .24 which was not significant at the .05 level. This finding offers support for the failure to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of individual counseling and perceptions of the counselor.

The results cited above offer support for the failure to reject the null hypothesis, however, there was a significant positive correlation between Category A_1 of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .39$, $p < .05$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more the students tended to assign a high rating to Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor.

Hypothesis II.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions as measured by Category A_{2-7} of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions as measured by Category A_{2-7} of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Category A_{2-7} of the GPES measures student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions. There was a significant positive correlation between Category A_{2-7} of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI ($r = .38$, $p < .05$). This finding offers support for the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program activities and provisions.

Category A_{2-7} contains six scales of the GPES each of which measures some facet of student perception of guidance program activities and provisions. Inspection of Table 8 indicates that there were seven significant positive correlations, besides the one cited above, between scales of Category A_{2-7} with T_C and I computed separately as well as combined. These additional correlations are reported below.

Scale A-3 of the GPES is labeled Student Information Service. There were significant positive correlations between Scale A-3 of the GPES with: T_C + I ($r = .46$, $p < .05$); T_C ($r = .47$, $p < .05$); and I ($r = .37$, $p < .05$) of the POI. These findings indicate that the more the counselor appeared to be self-actualized, live in the here and now and be inner-directed rather than outer-directed the more the students tended to assign a high rating to the Student Information Service.

Scale A-4 of the GPES is labeled Guidance Information Service. There were significant positive correlations between Scale A-4 of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI ($r = .40$, $p < .05$) and with T_C of the POI ($r = .46$, $p < .05$). These findings indicate that the more the counselor appeared to be self-actualized and live in the here and now the more the students tended to assign a high rating to the Guidance Information Service.

Scale A-6 of the GPES is labeled Guidance Organization and Administration. There was a significant positive correlation between Scales A-6 of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .45$, $p < .05$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more the students tended to assign a high rating to the organization and administration of the guidance program.

There was a significant positive correlation between the mean of A_{2-7} of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .52$, $p < .01$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more the students tended to assign a high rating to the Guidance Program Activities and Provisions.

Hypothesis III.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the attainment of guidance objectives as measured by Category B of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of the attainment of the guidance objectives as measured by Category B of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Category B of the GPES measures student perception of the attainment of guidance objectives. The correlation between Category B of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI was .10 which was not significant at the .05 level. This finding offers support for the failure to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the attainment of guidance objectives.

The results cited above offer support for the failure to reject the null hypothesis, however there were two significant positive correlations among the scales of Category B with T_C and I computed separately as well as combined. Scale B-1 is labeled Vocational Career Development. There was a significant positive correlation between B-1 of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI ($r = .38$, $p < .05$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to be self-actualized the more the students tended to know about the world of work.

Scale B-3 of the GPES is labeled Post High School Planning and Entrance. There was a significant positive correlation between Scale B-3 of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .36$, $p < .05$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more the students tended to know about post high school planning and entrance requirements.

Hypothesis IV.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance as measured by Category D of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance as measured by Category D of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

For purposes of this study, the preferred response to items in Category D was "Counselor". Items in this category ask the student to identify the individual who has been the source of assistance in various areas. The correlation between Category D of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI was .56 which was significant at the .01 level. This finding offers support for the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant positive correlation between the level of self-actualization and student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance.

In addition to the results cited above, there were significant positive correlations between Category D of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .44$, $p < .05$) and with I of the POI ($r = .52$, $p < .01$). These findings indicate that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now and be inner-directed rather than outer-directed the more the students tended to view the counselor as a source of assistance in meeting the guidance objectives.

Hypothesis V.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student evaluation of the guidance program as measured by Category E of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_1: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student evaluation of the guidance program as measured by Category E of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

Category E of the GPES is comprised of five semantic differential items which permit the student to rate various aspects of the guidance program. The correlation between Category E of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI was .33 which was not significant at the .05 level. This finding offers support for the failure to reject the null hypothesis. There is no significant correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization and student rating of various aspects of the guidance program as measured by Category E of the GPES.

Hypothesis VI.

H_o: There is no correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of their entire guidance program as measured by the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

H_i: There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory with student perception of their entire guidance program as measured by the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey.

The grand mean serves as an overall index of student perception of the entire guidance program. The correlation between the grand mean of the GPES with T_C + I of the POI was .35 which was significant at the .05 level. This finding offers support for the rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the entire guidance program.

In addition to the results cited above, there was a significant positive correlation between the grand mean of the GPES with T_C of the POI ($r = .51$, $p < .01$). This finding indicates that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more the students tended to assign a high overall rating of the entire guidance program.

SUMMARY

The basic question this investigation sought to answer was: What is the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program? The results of the testing of three of the six hypotheses indicate a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by T_C + I of the POI with two categories and the grand mean of the GPES. The two categories are: (1) Guidance Program

Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7}), and (2) student identification of the counselor as a source of assistance (D). The grand mean serves as an overall index of student perception of the entire guidance program. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for each of the hypotheses cited above.

There was no significant correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by T_C + I of the POI with three categories of the GPES. The three categories are: (1) Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor (A_1); (2) Guidance Objectives (B); and (3) Semantic Differential Items Used to Rate Generally the Guidance Program (E). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for these three hypotheses.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

OVERVIEW

Research efforts to discover and define the characteristics of the effective counselor have been diverse and numerous, both regarding research design and establishing a single criterion by which to measure counselor effectiveness. The study of counselor personality has been the focal point of research by counselor-educators for more than twenty-five years (Hill & Green, 1960; Stripling & Lister, 1963). Polmantier (1966) suggested in 1947 and again in 1966 that there is a need for research dealing with personal characteristics of the counselor. Polmantier (1966:95) concluded ". . . that there is much yet to be known about the personal characteristics of counselors, as well as the significance of these characteristics for success in counseling."

It would appear from the reviews of the literature by Walton and Sweeney (1969) and Hill and Green (1960) that where recipients of counseling have been employed as judges of counselor effectiveness they have tended to be limited to the clinical setting rather than the school. Where students in the school setting have judged the effectiveness of the counselor it has been limited to only those students who received counseling. Clearly the job of the school counselor is not limited to only those students who receive individual counseling.

To some extent, both counselor personality and student perception of the guidance program have been investigated separately. There appears to be virtually no research which has correlated counselor personality with student perception of the guidance program. It is therefore appropriate and necessary to investigate the relationship between counselor personality and student perception of the guidance program.

This field study was undertaken to investigate the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program. Self-actualization was measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (1966). Student perception of the guidance program was measured by Wysong's Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (1971a).

The sample for this study included counselors in twenty-three schools who satisfactorily completed the POI and their respective eleventh grade students who satisfactorily completed the GPES. The group of twenty-three counselors represented those volunteers who were among the 114 counselors listed in the Directory of Ohio School Counselors (Frericks, 1970) as the only counselor employed in their high school which was located within 125 miles of Toledo.

For the purposes of hypothesis testing an overall index of self-actualization was used by combining the two basic scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). These scales are the Time Competent (T_C) and Inner-Directed (I). The Time Competent individual may be characterized as living in the here and now and having placed into proper perspective past experiences and future plans. The inner-directed individual may be characterized as one who has a flexible set of principles by which he lives. His behavior is guided primarily by this set of internalized principles as opposed to external influences.

The scores on five categories and the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey were correlated with the combined T_C and I score of the Personal Orientation Inventory for all twenty-three schools. The categories of the GPES were: (1) Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor (A_1); (2) Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7}); (3) Guidance Objectives (B); (4) Identification of Persons in School who are Regarded as the Most Helpful in Assisting Students to Accomplish Guidance Objectives (D); and (5) Semantic Differential Items Used to Rate Generally the Guidance Program (E). The grand mean serves as an overall index of student perception of the entire guidance program. A t-test to determine whether the correlation differed significantly from zero was computed with alpha set at .05 for each of the correlations.

The results of the testing of three of the six hypotheses indicate a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the POI with two categories and the grand mean of the GPES. The two categories are: (1) Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7}) and (2) identification of persons in school who are regarded as the most helpful in assisting students to accomplish guidance objectives (D).

In summary, the more the counselor tended to appear to be self-actualized the more the students tended to assign a high rating to: (1) the Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7}); (2) the identification of the counselor as a source of assistance (D), and; (3) the overall success of the guidance program (grand mean). There were no significant correlations between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined score of T_C and I of the POI with the following three categories of the CPES: (1) Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor (A_1): (2) Guidance Objectives (B), and; (3) Semantic Differential Items Used to Rate Generally the Guidance Program (E). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected for these categories.

Guidance Programs which received a high rating by students tended to be administered by counselors who received high scores on the Time-Competence scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory. Such an individual is characterized as dealing primarily with the "here and now." According to Shostrom (1966:15): "He is able to tie the past and the future to the present in a meaningful continuity. He appears to be less burdened by guilts, regrets and resentments..." A Time-Competent individual tends to be able to respond to the needs and expectations of the moment while simultaneously placing them into their proper perspective in terms of the past and the future.

Additional longitudinal field research is needed. Counselor sex, age and type and extent of graduate training need to be correlated with student perception of the guidance program. Student input as a source of evaluation of the guidance program is essential. Student sex and age and the type of self-reported counseling contact the student has received should be correlated separately with counselor personality.

DISCUSSION

What is the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program? The results of the hypothesis testing as reported in Table 8 (see Chapter IV.) indicate that there are several significant correlations. The combined Time Competent and Inner-Directed (T_C + I) score of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was significantly correlated with Categories A_{2-7}, D and the grand mean of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey (GPES). The more the counselor appeared self-actualized the more the students tended to assign a high rating to: (1) the guidance program activities and provisions (A_{2-7}); (2) identification of the counselor as a source of assistance (D) and; (3) the overall success of the entire guidance program (grand mean). In essence, the more psychologically healthy the counselor as measured by the POI the more likely the students were to assign a high rating to the guidance program.

Upon closer examination of Table 8 (See Chapter IV.) it is evident that there were no significant correlations between the combined T_C and I score with student perception of the counselor (A_1); student attainment of the guidance objectives (B); or the semantic differential items used to measure student evaluation of the guidance program success (E). The most interesting finding, to this writer, is that Category A_1 which was believed to most closely measure some of the underlying constructs of the POI was not significantly correlated with the combined T_C and I score but was significantly correlated with the T_C score alone.

Category A_1 is labeled Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor and contains fifteen items. Since this study made no attempt at controlling for or identifying how each counselor implemented his particular guidance program, it is virtually impossible to determine exactly why there was a significant correlation between the Time-Competence scale with A_1 but not between the Inner-Directed scale with A_1. The Time-Competent individual is identified as being tuned in to the "now" experiences around him. He is seen as the individual who is open to his experiences and receptive to those of others. An individual whose observable behavior is consistent with the value of Time-Competence may be perceived as highly visable to those around him.

In counting the number of significant correlations in Table 8 (See Chapter IV) between all of the categories and each of the scales of Categories A_{2-7} and B of the GPES with the combined as well as separate T_C and I scores it is obvious that there are more correlations which are significant with T_C alone than with the combined T_C and I score of the POI. This is one of the unpredicted findings of this investigation.

Why did the Time-Competent score of the POI correlate so highly with the GPES when the combined T_C and I and the separate I scores did not? What is it about either of the instruments, the counselors or their work setting that could affect the results? First the instruments will be discussed and then the possible influences of the school environment will be discussed.

Instruments

The GPES seems to be an excellent instrument to measure student perception of the guidance program. The focus of this study was upon the use of all students in the eleventh grade without regard to whether or not they had received direct service from the counselor. The input was not limited to those few individuals who received individual or small group counseling. In the scoring of the GPES no attempt was made to identify those students who received counseling in order to correlate their responses with the level of counselor self-actualization. The perceptions of "all students" may be different from the perceptions of those few students who know the counselor best because they have had individual long-term counseling.

The Personal Orientation Inventory is divided into two basic scales, i.e.,Time Competent and Inner-Directed. An individual with a high score on T_C is characterized as living in the here and now, not dwelling on past experiences nor over emphasizing the future. The T_C scale, to this writer, appears to measure a personal construct which is not as unique as that measured by the Inner-Directed scale of the POI. It seems as though our culture places a greater premium on being able to deal with the here and now than being inner-directed.

The inner-directed individual is characterized as being guided by an internalized set of principles. The inner-directed person is spontaneous; open to his own experiences and feelings as well as those of others; possesses the capacity for intimate contact and is able to reach out and touch the lives of others in a meaningful and selfless manner. The inner-directed person is contrasted with the outer-directed individual whose values are largely derived from those around him. Although the qualities cited above in reference to the inner-directed individual seem to this writer to be desirable, one must wonder whether our culture in general values an individual who possesses them.

The School Environment

The information reported below provides additional insight into how the students who participated in this study viewed school and their guidance program. This information represents an attempt to place the study results in a slightly broader perspective.

Several items of the GPES were excluded from the correlational analyses of this study because no preferred response could be identified (Wysong, 1971b), however the data related to these items is useful in understanding student perception of the guidance program. Since the responses to these items were not correlated with the counselors' scores on the POI no inferences can be made about the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization and student perception of the guidance program as measured by the GPES items represented in Tables 9 and 10.

Items 101 to 105 of the GPES provide the students with the opportunity to rank in order of importance the ways in which counselors might be of assistance to students. The complete frequency distribution for each of these items may be found in Appendix I. The order was determined by ranking the cumulative frequency of each item. Table 9 summarizes the results. Students tend to view the role of the counselor as one which is primarily associated with school related activities and which is largely to the exclusion of involvement with personal concerns.

Table 9

Student Rankings of Ways in which Some Counselors Can Be of Help to Students Based on a Frequency Distribution of 1,658 Students' Responses to Questions 101 to 105 of the GPES

Alternative	Number*	Percent*	Rank
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	670	40.70	1
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	332	20.00	2
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	321	19.40	3
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	241	16.60	4
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	554	33.40	5

* Column totals represent less than the entire sample because of omissions of responses

It is interesting to note that the students who participated in this study ranked as their least important priority of ways in which a counselor may be of some assistance the area of counseling students with personal and social problems. (See Table 9) It is the personal and social type of problem that frequently tends to be most time consuming and least conspicuous to large groups of students.

Assisting students with educational or occupational planning is an activity which is appropriately conspicuous and is provided for many more students than individual counseling devoted to personal or social problems. Students who participated in this study ranked educational and occupational type guidance as their first priority. (See Table 9) It would seem reasonable to assume that a counselor assisting a student in making post high school plans is less likely to develop a close, intimate and spontaneous relationship than if the counselor were working on a long-term counseling case involving a personal problem.

Item 95 asks the students: "Which of the following is the most important reason to you for being in school?" Over one third of the students responded "improving yourself." The results have been ranked in descending order from the alternative with the highest frequency of response to the lowest in Table 10.

Table 10

Student Ranking of the Most Important Reason for Being in School Based on 1,658 Students

Alternative	Number	Percent	Rank
2. Improving yourself	621	37.50	1
4. Getting a diploma	300	18.10	2
3. Getting into college	296	17.90	3
1. Training for a job	225	13.60	4
5. I don't know	182	11.00	5
omit	34	1.90	6

There is an interesting disparity between the results presented in Tables 9 and 10. When students were asked to rank in order of importance the reasons for being in school the first ranking was "Improving yourself." (See Table 10.) The third and fourth items of importance for being in school according to the students who participated in this study were related to entering post high school education or employment. In other words, post high school planning was towards the bottom of students' priorities for being in school.

When these same students were asked to rank the ways in which some counselors might be of assistance to them the first rank was assigned to "Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school." The last rank was assigned to "Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with others." It would appear that counselors are viewed by students as being able to assist them in post high school planning although this is not one of the students' higher priorities for being in school. Students stated that the most important reason for being in school was "Improving yourself." (See Table 10.) They did not view the counselors as a primary source of help in terms of dealing with personal problems. These results would tend to suggest that although counselors appear competent in implementing various areas of the guidance program these areas do not coincide with the stated priorities of the students for being in school.

In conclusion, there is a significant positive correlation between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the combined T_C and I score of the POI with Categories A_{2-7} and D and the grand mean of the GPES. These findings indicate that the more the counselor tended to appear self-actualized the more the students tended to assign a high rating to (1) Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (2) identification of the counselor as a source of assistance, and (3) the overall success of the guidance program.

The Time-Competent scale accounted for more signifcant correlations when computed separately than when combined with the I scale. This would suggest that the more the counselor appeared to live in the here and now the more his students tended to assign him high ratings on several of the GPES categories and scales. The school environment may likely influence the counselor's behavior. It was beyond the scope of this study to control for or identify how each counselor implemented his own particular guidance program. Nevertheless, the Time-Competent individual may be characterized as effectively dealing with the present without being rigidly bound to the past or overly concerned about the future. It is possible that the school setting reinforces the individual with such characteristics. Being responsive to the needs and expectations of the students may perpetuate Time-Competant counselor behavior.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The use of students as a source of input is relatively rare in the area of guidance program evaluations. There have been virtually no studies where the results of student perception of guidance programs have been correlated with counselor personality. Thus, the findings of this study have tended to produce more questions yet to be answered than actual answers. The need for extensive research concerning the efficacy and value of guidance programs is obvious. The concept of accountability at the present time seems to have made a great impact on many of our public school administrators. Consumer reaction to services which the school provides is an issue with which we must contend. The following are several areas where additional research seems warranted.

Research in education must be broad based, that is, the samples used should represent rural, suburban and urban communities. It is possible that what it takes to be a successful counselor in a rural setting differs from what it takes to be a successful counselor in an urban setting. Studies which correlate student perception of the guidance program with counselor personality should include a larger and more representative sample of counselors in various settings than were included in this study.

Students should not be the only source of input in terms of evaluating guidance programs. Administrators, guidance counselors, parents and teachers should also participate. The results of the surveys completed by such diverse groups should be correlated with counselor personality.

It is possible that counselor age, sex and type of graduate training influence his performance on the job and therefore his students' perceptions of the guidance program. Future research should investigate the relationship between these variables with student perception. Not only should the relationship between the age and sex of the counselor with student perception of the guidance program be investigated, but also the relationship between the age and sex of the student with student perception of the guidance program. The surveys of male and female students should be separately correlated with counselor personality.

The evaluation of guidance programs using students as a source of input without regard to whether or not the student received direct service should be continued. It would seem wise, though, to separate the surveys of those students who did receive individual counseling from those who did not in the correlational analyses so as to determine whether student perception is affected by intensive contact with the counselor and if so, in what ways.

School environments vary considerably as do the expectations placed upon counselors. Field research should attempt to hold constant the nature of the counselors' activities and the organizational structure of the school during such investigations. Knowledge of what roles and functions the counselor performs would facilitate the interpretation of consumer completed surveys.

If the above recommendations are to be implemented, additional instrumentation will be essential. The present study used a student survey which was based upon Wysong's Taxonomy of Guidance Objectives (1968). It would be valuable to have students develop their own criteria by which to evaluate their guidance program. Clearly, student-developed instruments should not be the only source of input of student perception of the guidance program. In general the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 proved to be an excellent instrument. The use of semantic differential items should be expanded upon since there were only five such items in Form A-4. The use of this technique of assessing student perception of their guidance program seems promising and warrants further investigation.

Tosi and Hoffman's (1972) factor analysis of the POI generated three main factors which raise some questions about the present structure of the POI scales. Future researchers may find it wise to score the POI both conventionally and according to the three main factors which emerged. These scores could then be correlated with student, administrator, guidance counselor, parent and teacher perception of the guidance program. Other personality instruments should also be considered. The use of a battery of such tests used in a multiphasic study would likely yield a greater amount of data and possibly more concrete results.

Despite the expense and difficulty related to longitudinal research there is a definite need for it in the field of guidance and counseling. Several specific questions which might be investigated are: Do individuals with a certain type of POI profile meet with greater success as counselors in the schools? What effect do counselor education programs which emphasize personal growth have upon perceived counselor competence? To what extent does the school environment influence the degree to which the counselor may appear to be inner-directed? Is the concept of self-actualization a practical and legitimate goal of counselor education programs? These questions warrant further research.

In conclusion, although the writer's study has partially answered the question about the relationship between the level of counselor self-actualization as measured by the POI and student perception of the guidance program as measured by the GPES, it has also raised some issues worthy of additional investigation. Research which is conducted in the field with fully trained and experienced counselors is essential. The use of students as a source of input warrants additional study. The gap between research conducted with counselors-in-training and field research must be reduced. Longitudinal studies which follow the potential counselor through his graduate program and into employment as a counselor are necessary. This is one way to overcome the lack of information about the relationship between desirable counselor personality characteristics as viewed by both counselor-educators and consumers of the guidance services.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

Forms Used for Initial Mailing

Guidance and Counselor Education
College of Education
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
August 15, 1971

Dear

For my doctoral dissertation I would like to do research involving counselors out in the schools. It is important for me to have some specific information before I decide whether this particular project is both feasible and practical.

In brief, each counselor who participates will be asked to (a) complete a personality inventory which should take no more than forty-five minutes, and (b) supervise the administration of a questionnaire dealing with the guidance program to his entire junior class.

The results of the personality inventory will be kept confidential. The results of the student completed questionnaires, which will be tabulated by me with the assistance of The University of Toledo's Computer Center, will be returned promptly to each participating counselor.

Of those counselors who show an interest in this project, a sample will be randomly selected and asked to participate. However, those counselors who show an interest at this time are in no way obligated if they should at a later date be invited to participate.

It is extremely important to the success of this endeavor that you respond honestly to the enclosed survey. There is no need to sign your name unless you are interested. In any case, please return the survey by September 15, 1971.

Stephen G. Weinrach
Doctoral Student

Dr. Jeffrey K. Messing
Associate Professor of Education
and Committee Chairman

Dr. Robert A. Bernhoft
Associate Professor of Education
Committee Member

Dr. H. Eugene Wysong
Associate Professor of Education
Committee Member

Field Research Feasibility Survey

1. I am interested in being considered for this research project.

_____ yes (if "yes" please complete the remainder of this survey)

_____ no (if "no" kindly return this survey in the post-paid envelope. Thank you.)

2. How many full-time counselors will work in your school during the 1971-72 school year? _____

3. How many part-time counselors will work in your school during the 1971-72 school year? _____

4. Do you hold an Ohio School Counselor's Certificate? ____

5. Approximately how many students are enrolled in your high school? _____

6. Which grades are included in your high school? _____

7. ____________________ Counselor's name

____________________ School

____________________ School phone number

____________________ School address

Thank you for your cooperation and time. Please return this survey prior to September 15, 1971 to:

Stephen G. Weinrach
Department of Guidance and Counselor
 Education
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

APPENDIX B

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4

Survey Form A-4

GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION

Student Survey

This survey is for the purpose of collecting information which will be helpful to the guidance program in your school. You and other students are asked to give the information which is needed. A study will be made on how the total group answers each question. It is important that you read each question carefully and answer according to your true opinion. Your answers will give information on how the school can be of better help to students.

Directions

You will use a number 2 pencil to mark your answers on a separate answer sheet.
DO NOT USE A PEN.

On the answer sheet, print your name, school, and grade. You need not fill in the other spaces unless told to do so.

In this booklet there are some questions which you can answer by placing a mark in the proper space under the numbers on your answer sheet. Answer each question in the following way:

	1	2	3	4	5
If YES is a better answer than NO, then fill in the space under "1" like this:	▨	---	---	---	---
If NO is a better answer than YES, then fill in the space under "2" like this:	---	▨	---	---	---
If you DON'T KNOW which is better, then fill in the space under "3" like this:	---	---	▨	---	---

IMPORTANT: Sometimes a "yes" or a "no" answer will not give a completely accurate answer. However, choose the one which is a better answer than the other. Use a "don't know" answer only when you have no information at all or when "yes" and "no" answers are equally true. If you believe that a question is not appropriate, you need not answer that question.

Each of the following questions asks for information which is important. Answer the questions as they apply only to this school. Remember, only an honest answer will be helpful to the school. You may now go ahead and answer the questions. Please notice that the items are numbered from left to right on your answer sheet.

(Go on to the next page)

Do not reproduce or use without authorization
Restricted Edition, all publishing rights are reserved
November, 1971

1. Has your counselor ever been of help to you?

2. When meeting with you, does your counselor usually talk about the things you want to talk about?

3. Have you ever talked with the counselor for the purpose of selecting or changing your schedule of school subjects?

4. Have you ever talked with the counselor about any problems you have had in your school subjects or school activities?

5. Have you ever talked with the counselor about your aptitudes, interests, or personal traits?

6. Have you ever talked with the counselor about making plans for an occupation or further education after high school?

7. Have you ever talked with the counselor about a personal problem of yours or some trouble you have had with another individual?

8. Does your counselor seem to be willing to listen to the ideas which students have?

9. Is your counselor able to understand young people?

10. Do you believe that your counselor is really interested in you?

11. Would you feel free to talk with your counselor about a personal problem, if you had one?

12. Is your counselor the kind of person who is easy to talk with?

13. Can students obtain from a counselor occupational information which is accurate and up-to-date?

14. Have you ever been with a counselor in a small counseling group when the students talked about their concerns?

15. If your answer to question 14 was "yes," did you think the group counseling was worthwhile to you? If your answer to question 14 was "no," leave this question blank.

16. When a counselor talks with a large group or class of students, is it usually interesting?

17. When a counselor talks with a large group or class of students, is it usually helpful to the students?

18. Do you know approximately how you scored on the standardized ability and achievement tests you have taken?

19. If you desire, would your counselor explain to you the information which is in your school records?

20. Has the information which is kept in your school records ever been explained to you?

21. Do you believe that your counselor knows about most of your plans or desires for a future occupation or education?

22. Have any of the school's books or pamphlets on colleges or other schools ever been of help to you?

23. Have any of the school's books or pamphlets on occupations ever been of help to you?

24. Does your school have books or pamphlets on how to get training to become an auto mechanic, cosmetologist, or some other skilled trade?

25. Does the school have information about almost every occupation in the United States?

26. Are guidance informational materials kept in the library?

27. Has your counselor ever suggested that you talk to a teacher?

28. Does your counselor know where students can get help if they have some special emotional problems?

29. Do you know what steps a person needs to take to get into college or some other school?

30. Do you know what steps a person needs to take to get a job?

31. Do you think that your counselor knows your name?

32. Do you think that every school should have at least one counselor who has time to help individual students?

33. Do you think that students should try to fail a subject?

34. Is your counselor usually too busy to help you much?

35. Do you think that your counselor is doing the kinds of things that a counselor should be doing to help students?

36. Have you ever gone on your own to the counselor and asked for some kind of help?

37. Has a counselor ever contacted you and asked to have a meeting with you?

38. Do you know about the different ways in which a counselor can help students?

39. Have you ever been in a class when the teacher sent a student to the counselor because the student was a discipline problem?

40. Is the counselor more concerned with students who are going to college than those who are going to full-time employment after graduation?

41. Are the procedures for making an appointment with a counselor satisfactory to you?

42. Do most teachers take class time to discuss occupations related to their subject field?

43. Do most teachers take class time to discuss educational opportunities beyond high school which are related to their subject field?

44. Would you feel free to talk with one of the teachers about a personal problem if you had one?

45. Do you believe that most of your teachers are really interested in you?

46. Are teachers the kind of people who are easy to talk with?

47. Has a teacher ever suggested that you talk with a counselor?

48. Right now does your future occupation look like it will be a good one?

49. Do you know how to find information about any occupation in the United States?

50. Do you know of at least five different occupations in which you probably could be satisfied and successful?

51. Do you know what is required to get into an occupation which is of interest to you?

52. Should a student choose those school subjects in which he can get the best grades?

53. Do you think that you have made the best choice of subjects for this year that you could have made?

54. Did you ever choose to take a subject because a friend had decided to take it?

55. If a student is having trouble in a school subject should he try to get out of the course before he gets failing grades?

56. Are you now taking a school subject which is too difficult for you?

57. Can students who take vocational education in high school go on to a four-year college?

58. Would you be willing to borrow money for the purpose of getting more education after you graduate from high school?

59. Should almost everybody get a college education?

60. Are there any two-year technical schools in your state?

61. Do almost all colleges require that a student have at least two years of a foreign language in high school?

62. Do you know what training is required for the occupation of most interest to you?

63. Do you know about the kinds of training opportunities which are available to high school graduates?

64. Can you study well while you are in school?

65. Can you study very well while you are at home?

66. Do you usually wait until the teacher plans to give a test before you really study?

67. Do you think that you could learn more if the school day were shortened?

68. Are most of the school rules fair to students?

69. Do you take part in very many class discussions?

70. Do you like to participate in school activities?

71. Do you wish that you were in a different school?

72. Are you now taking a subject which you don't like?

73. Do you know what occupations are closely related to your abilities?

74. Can a good aptitude test tell a student what occupation he should enter?

75. Are there things about you which are different than most other people?

76. Do you have several very close friends in this school?

77. Are most of the students in this school friendly?

78. Can you usually get adults to understand your point of view?

79. Do you think that a school should try to help all students to get a good education?

Directions: What one individual in your school has given you the best help in assisting you to do the following? On your answer sheet, fill in the space under the number which describes the person who has given you the best help. If no one in the school has given you any good help, fill in the space under the number 5.

80. Assisting you to select your school subjects: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

81. Assisting you to plan ways to study better: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

82. Assisting you to plan for your future education after high school: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

83. Assisting you to plan your occupational career: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

84. Assisting you to learn more about your aptitudes, interests, or personal traits: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

85. Assisting you to get along better with other people: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

86. Assisting you to learn about the school when you first came as a new student: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

87. Assisting you to learn how you scored on standardized ability and achievement tests: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

88. Assisting you to solve a personal problem: 1. Teacher 2. Counselor 3. Student 4. Principal 5. No one

Directions: In the following items, choose the one response which best answers the question.

89. Approximately how many time this year have you had an individual conference with a counselor in this school? 1. none 2. one 3. two-four 4. five-seven 5. eight or more

90. Approximately, how many times have you ever had an individual conference with a counselor in this school? 1. none 2. one 3. two-four 4. five-seven 5. eight or more

91. When a choice can be made, who should decide which school subjects a student will take? 1. parent 2. counselor 3. teacher 4. principal 5. none of these

92. How many school clubs, teams, or other school organizations have you belonged to so far this year? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more

93. How many school subjects have you ever failed during all your secondary school years? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more

94. How many times during all your school life have you been held back a year because of failure? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more

95. Which of the following is the most important reason to you for being in school. 1. training for a job 2. improving yourself 3. getting into college 4. getting a diploma 5. I don't know

96. The guidance program is: 1. very active 2. mostly active 3. in between 4. mostly inactive 5. very inactive

97. The guidance program is: 1. very unsuccessful 2. mostly unsuccessful 3. in between 4. mostly successful 5. very successful

98. The guidance program is: 1. very weak 2. mostly weak 3. in between 4. mostly strong 5. very strong

99. The guidance program is: 1. very unimportant 2. mostly unimportant 3. in between 4. mostly important 5. very important

100. The guidance program is: 1. very bad 2. mostly bad 3. in between 4. mostly good 5. very good

Directions: Following is a list of ways in which some counselors might be of help to students. Use this list in answering items 101-105.

Counselor's services to students:

1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects.
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities.
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits.
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school.
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals.

101. Which of the above counselor services to students do you think is most important? (Fill in the space under the appropriate number on the answer sheet.)

102. Which of the above services is the second most important?

103. Which of the above services is the third most important?

104. Which of the above services is the fourth most important?

105. Which of the above services is the least important?

Thank you for your help.

H. Eugene Wysong
Associate Professor of Education
The University of Toledo

APPENDIX C

Forms Used for Second Mailing

Guidance and Counselor Education
College of Education
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Several weeks ago you indicated an interest in participating in my field research project. I am most appreciative for your interest and at this time would like to request your participation.

In order to facilitate your decision to participate, I have enclosed a copy of the instrument for your examination. You will be asked either to administer or supervise the administration of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey to the entire eleventh grade class in your school. The survey is scheduled to be given during the first week of December, 1971. The results will be tabulated and reported to you several weeks later. Of course, the results of the personal characteristics inventory that each counselor will take, will be kept confidential as well as the identity of each school and its counselor. There will be no costs whatsoever to the school or the counselor for this study. The results of the survey will provide you with additional information about your student body.

In addition to the enclosed copy of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, there is a short questionnaire. Please ask your principal to also sign it and then return it to me as soon as possible.

There is a scarcity of research concentrating on students and counselors who are out in the field largely because such research requires the cooperation of so many people. In order for me to run this study I need the cooperation of virtually all who indicated an interest several weeks ago. I am counting on everyone's help. If you have any questions, feel free either to write or call. My home phone number is 419-536-3639. I can also be reached at the University of Toledo at 419-531-5711, extension 2718.

Sincerely,

Stephen G. Weinrach
Doctoral Student

STG/prp

Encl. 3

Field Research Participation Form

October 4, 1971

1. I am willing to participate in your field research project.

   Yes _____ No _____

2. How many students are enrolled in your junior class (eleventh grade)?

   _____ (students)

3. Approximately how many miles are you from Toledo, Ohio?

   _____ (miles)

4. We understand that the research project will include the administration of the enclosed Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey to all eleventh grade students at no cost to the school. Furthermore, the counselor will take a short personal characteristics inventory. The identity of both the school and the counselor will remain confidential. The results of the survey will be sent to each counselor.

Signature of Counselor	Signature of Principal
Name of Counselor (Print)	Name of School
School's Mailing Address	City and Zip Code

Thank you for your cooperation and time. Kindly return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible to:

Stephen G. Weinrach
Department of Guidance and
Counselor Education
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Field Research Project Supply Need

and

Participation Form

Please complete the following. Make any corrections necessary. Thank you.

1. Name of School: ______________________________

2. Name of Counselor: ______________________________

*3. Research Code Number: ______________________________

4. Total number of separate answer sheets needed based on the number of juniors in your school building. __________

5. Total number of separate Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey forms necessary. __________ (This number should be computed on the basis of the number of students taking the survey at any one time).

6. We understand that the research project will include the administration of the enclosed Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey to all eleventh grade students at no cost to the school. Furthermore, the counselor will take a short personal characteristics inventory. The identity of both the school and the counselor will remain confidential. The results of the survey will be sent to each counselor.

____________________ ____________________

Signature of Counselor Signature of Principal

7. We are not able to participate at this time. _____ (Check if applicable.)

Please return as soon as possible to:

Stephen G. Weinrach
Guidance and Counselor Education
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

*Please leave blank.

APPENDIX D

Personal Information Form

Personal Information Form

Please print all information. Thank you.

1. Name: (Mr., Mrs., Miss) ______________________________

2. Sex: female ( ) male ( )

3. In what year did you receive your Ohio School Counselor's Certification? 19___

4. From what school did you receive your Masters degree? __________

5. What was your major in your Masters degree program? ____________

6. What was your minor in your Masters degree program? ____________

7. Last full-time teaching position:

Dates	Grades	Subject(s) taught

8. Previous full-time counseling position: (If none, leave blank)

Dates	Grades

9. Total number of years experience as a full-time or at least 3/4 time counselor: ____________ years

10. Which professional organizations are you a member of and for how many years?

11. Signature of Counselor: ______________________________

APPENDIX E

Materials Related to the Use of the GPES

Directions for the Administration of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4

I. Testing Time: Approximately 40 minutes

II. Testing Materials: (A) #2 pencils (not supplied)
(B) Survey Booklets (supplied)
(C) IBM Answer sheets (supplied)

III. Distribute the IBM Answer sheets

A. Read the following directions:

"Fill in the top two lines of the answer sheet. Please print all the information. Include: Your name; today's date, which is December_____; your age; your sex; and your date of birth. On the second line write the name of our school, (name of city) ________; and next to 'grade' write the number 11 (eleven). Do not include 'instructor.' Leave the third line blank."

B. Give the student a few moments to complete this portion of the directions.

C. Write the school identification number on the blackboard. Your school's number is:

D. Read the following directions:

"Now look at the box labeled 'identification number.' Our school's identification number is_____. Write the three numbers under the red arrow in the first three boxes. Now blacken the appropriate spaces next to each box."

IV. Distribute the Student Survey now and give the following directions:

A. "Read the directions on the front of the booklet to yourself quietly. In a few moments I will read the directions aloud to you. After a few minutes read the following directions which also appear on the students' copies of the Survey.

B. "You will use a number 2 pencil to mark your answers on a separate sheet.

DO NOT USE A PEN.

On the answer sheet, print your name, school, and grade. You need not fill in the other spaces unless told to do so. In this booklet there are some questions which you can answer by placing a mark in the proper space under the numbers on your answer sheet. Answer each question in the following way:

If YES is a better answer than NO, then 1 2 3 4 5
fill in the space under "1" like this: ■ --- --- --- ---

If NO is a better answer than YES, then 1 2 3 4 5
fill in the space under "2" like this: --- ■ --- --- ---

If you DON'T KNOW which is better then 1 2 3 4 5
fill in the space under "3" like this: --- --- ■ --- ---

IMPORTANT: Sometimes a "yes" or a "no" answer will not give a completely accurate answer. However, choose the one which is a better answer than the other. Use a "don't know" answer only when you have no information at all or when "yes" and "no" answers are equally true. If you believe that a question is not appropriate, you need not answer that question. Each of the following questions asks for information which is important. Answer the questions as they apply only to this school. Remember, only an honest answer will be helpful to the school. You may now go ahead and answer the questions."

C. "Are there any questions?"

D. "Before you begin, please look at the answer sheet. Notice that the answer spaces are numbered horizontally, that is, they go across the page. Be sure after you have answered the first question, you go across to the next block which is number two and so on."

E. "Are there any questions?"

F. "If there are no questions, please begin. This survey should take about forty minutes."

V. Directions for the Self-Administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory and the Personal Information Form

A. Testing Time:
  1. Personal Orientation Inventory approximately 45 minutes
  2. Personal Information Form-approximately 15 minutes

B. Testing Materials:
  1. Personal Orientation Inventory Booklet (supplied)
  2. Personal Orientation Inventory IBM Answer Sheet (supplied)
  3. Personal Information Form (supplied)
  4. #2 pencil (not supplied)

C. Directions:

Please complete the two instruments designated for the guidance counselor prior to returning the student survey materials. Be assured that all information will be kept confidential and at no time will either the counselors or their schools be identified in any manner other than by research identification number.

VI. Compliance with United States Postal Regulations:

These materials have been shipped under the "Library Rate." According to postal regulations, individually written or typed messages may not be included in such packages. Should it be necessary to correspond with me, kindly send the letter under separate cover. Please do not include any such correspondence inside the package of survey materials which you will be returning. Thank you for your cooperation.

VII. Reporting of Results of Student Survey:

A complete item analysis of the student survey with a description of the way to analyze the computer printout will be mailed after February 1, 1972.

Information for Use in Interpreting Student Survey Results

Guidance Program Evaluation Survey, Form A-4

H. Eugene Wysong
Associate Professor of Education
The University of Toledo
1971

This is a general summary of the content of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4. The purpose of this summary is to provide information on how the items are grouped and to identify those items which are related to other items in the survey.

I. Categories in Student Survey (Form A-4)

A. Guidance Program Activities and Provisions

1. Individual Counseling and Perceptions of the Counselor - Items 1-13, 89, 90
2. Group Guidance and Counseling - Items 14-17
3. Student Information Service - Items 18-21
4. Guidance Information Service - Items 22-26
5. Guidance Resources and Placement - Items 27-30
6. Guidance Organization and Administration - Items 31-41 (Except Item 33)
7. Teacher Participation in Guidance - Items 42-47

B. Guidance Objectives

1. Vocational Career Development - Items 48-51
2. Course Selection and Entrance - Items 52-56, 91
3. Post High School Education Planning and Entrance - Items 57-63
4. Study Skills and Habits - Items 64-66
5. Participation in School - Items 67-72, 92-95
6. Self Understanding and Acceptance - Items 73-75
7. Interpersonal Relationships - Items 76-78

C. Verification - Items 33 and 79 (Percent of preferred response should be above 90% for each item.)

D. Identification of persons in school who are regarded as the most helpful in assisting students to accomplish guidance objectives - Items 80-88

E. Semantic Differential Items used to rate generally the guidance program - Items 96-100

F. Rating the importance (need) of five kinds of counselor assistance - Items 101-105

II. Preferred Responses to the Student Survey, Form A-4

Item	Response	Item	Response	Item	Response
1	1	36	1	71	2
2	1	37	1	72	2
3	1	38	1	73	1
4	1	39	2	74	2
5	1	40	2	75	1
6	1	41	1	76	1
7	1	42	1	77	1
8	1	43	1	78	1
9	1	44	1	79	1
10	1	45	1	80	*
11	1	46	1	81	*
12	1	47	1	82	*
13	1	48	1	83	*
14	1	49	1	84	*
15	1	50	1	85	*
16	1	51	1	86	*
17	1	52	2	87	*
18	1	53	1	88	*
19	1	54	2	89	5
20	1	55	2	90	*
21	1	56	2	91	5
22	1	57	1	92	*
23	1	58	1	93	1
24	1	59	2	94	1
25	1	60	1	95	*
26	1	61	2	96	1
27	1	62	1	97	5
28	1	63	1	98	5
29	1	64	1	99	5
30	1	65	1	100	5
31	1	66	2	101	*
32	1	67	2	102	*
33	2	68	1	103	*
34	2	69	1	104	*
35	1	70	1	105	*

---

* No preferred response given

Common Factors of the

Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4

Factor 1. Students' Perception of the Counselor

1. Has your counselor ever been of help to you?
2. When meeting with you, does your counselor usually talk about the things you want to talk about?
8. Does your counselor seem to be willing to listen to the ideas which students have?
9. Is your counselor able to understand young people?
10. Do you believe that your counselor is really interested in you?
11. Would you feel free to talk with your counselor about a personal problem, if you had one?
12. Is your counselor the kind of person who is easy to talk with?
16. When a counselor talks with a large group or class of students, is it usually interesting?
17. When a counselor talks with a large group or class of students, is it usually helpful to the students?
34. Is your counselor usually too busy to help you much?
35. Do you think that your counselor is doing the kinds of things that a counselor should be doing to help students?
40. Is the counselor more concerned with students who are going to college than those who are going to full-time employment after graduation?
41. Are the procedures for making an appointment with a counselor satisfactory to you?
100. The guidance program is: 1. very bad 2. mostly bad 3. in between 4. mostly good 5. very good

Factor 2. Guidance Information Service

29. Do you know what steps a person needs to take to get into college or some other school?
30. Do you know what steps a person needs to take to get a job?
49. Do you know how to find information about any occupation in the United States?
51. Do you know what is required to get into an occupation which is of interest to you?
62. Do you know what training is required for the occupation of most insterest to you?

63. Do you know about the kinds of training opportunities which are available to high school graduates?
73. Do you know what occupations are closely related to your abilities?

Factor 3. Students' View of the Counselor as a Resource to Them Concerning Problems

*4. Have you ever talked with the counselor about any problems you have had in your school subjects or school activities?
*7. Have you ever talked with the counselor about a personal problem of yours or some trouble you have had with another individual?
*11. Would you feel free to talk with your counselor about a personal problem, if you had one?
*28. Does your counselor know where students can get help if they have some special emotional problems?

Factor 4. Students' Involvement in Their Subjects

*54. Did you ever choose to take a subject because a friend had decided to take it?
*66. Do you usually wait until the teacher plans to give a test before you really study?
*69. Do you take part in very many class discussions?

Factor 5. Verification Items

33. Do you think that students should try to fail a subject?
79. Do you think that a school should try to help all students to get a good education?

Factor 6. Group Counseling

14. Have you ever been with a counselor in a small counseling group when the students talked about their concerns?
15. If your answer to question 14 was "yes", did you think the group counseling was worthwhile to you? If your answer to question 14 was "no", leave this question blank.

Factor 7. Teacher Participation in Guidance

42. Do most teachers take class time to discuss occupations related to their subject field?

---

* A low score on this item coincides with what the factor measures.

43. Do most teachers take class time to discuss educational opportunities beyond high school which are related to their subject field?

Factor 8. Availability of Guidance Information to Students

13. Can students obtain from a counselor occupational information which is accurate and up-to-date?
19. If you desire, would your counselor explain to you the information which is in your school records?
24. Does your school have books or pamphlets on how to get training to become an auto mechanic, cosmetologist, or some other skilled trade?
25. Does the school have information about almost every occupation in the United States?
26. Are guidance informational materials kept in the library?
49. Do you know how to find information about any occupation in the United States?

Factor 9. Help Received by Students Concerning Educational or Vocational Plans

6. Have you ever talked with the counselor about making plans for an occupation or further education after high school?
22. Have any of the school's books or pamphlets on colleges or other schools ever been of help to you?
23. Have any of the school's books or pamphlets on occupations ever been of help to you?

Factor 10. Quality of Guidance Program

97. The guidance program is: 1. very unsuccessful 2. mostly unsuccessful 3. in between 4. mostly successful 5. very successful
98. The guidance program is: 1. very weak 2. mostly weak 3. in between 4. mostly strong 5. very strong
99. The guidance program is: 1. very unimportant 2. mostly unimportant 3. in between 4. mostly important 5. very important

Factor 11. Orientation of Students Toward the Importance of Grades

52. Should a student choose those school subjects in which he can get the best grades?
55. If a student is having trouble in a school subject should he try to get out of the course before he gets failing grades?

Factor 12. Student Identification with School

70. Do you like to participate in school activities?
71. Do you wish that you were in a different school?
76. Do you have several very close friends in this school?
77. Are most of the students in this school friendly?

Factor 13. Course Selection

56. Are you now taking a school subject which is too difficult for you?
64. Can you study well while you are in school?
72. Are you now taking a subject which you don't like?

Factor 14. Vocational Guidance

*5. Have you ever talked with the counselor about your aptitudes, interests, or personal traits?
*6. Have you ever talked with the counselor about making plans for an occupation or further education after high school?
*20. Has the information which is kept in your school records ever been explained to you?
*21. Do you believe that your counselor knows about most of your plans or desires for a future occupation or education?
*31. Do you think that your counselor knows your name?
*37. Has a counselor ever contacted you and asked to have a meeting with you?

Factor 15. Kinds of Contacts with the Counselor

1. Has your counselor ever been of help to you?
2. When meeting with you, does your counselor usually talk about the things you want to talk about?
3. Have you ever talked with the counselor for the purpose of selecting or changing your schedule of school subjects?
36. Have you ever gone on your own to the counselor and asked for some kind of help?

Factor 16. Attitudes Towards Adults and School

*18. Do you know approximately how you scored on the standardized ability and achievement tests you have taken?
*53. Do you think that you have made the best choice of subjects for this year that you could have made?
*68. Are most of the school rules fair to students?
*78. Can you usually get adults to understand your point of view?

---

* A low score on this item coincides with what the factor measures.

Factor 17. Frequency of Contacts with the Counselor

89. Approximately how many times *this year* have you had an *individual* conference with a counselor in this school? 1. none 2. one 3. two-four 4. five-seven 5. eight or more
90. Approximately, how many times have you *ever* had an *individual* conference with a counselor in this school? 1. none 2. one 3. two-four 4. five-seven 5. eight or more

Factor 18. Students' Perceptions of the Teachers

*44. Would you feel free to talk with one of the teachers about a personal problem if you had one?
*45. Do you believe that most of your teachers are really interested in you?
*46. Are teachers the kind of people who are easy to talk with?
*78. Can you usually get adults to understand your point of view?

Factor 19. Academic Success

93. How many school subjects have you ever failed during all your secondary school years? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more
94. How many times during all your school life have you been held back a year because of failure? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more

Factor 20. Knowledge of College Entrance Requirements

61. Do almost all colleges require that a student have at least two years of a foreign language in high school?

Factor 21. Referral Practices

27. Has your counselor ever suggested that you talk to a teacher?
47. Has a teacher ever suggested that you talk with a counselor?
*58. Would you be willing to borrow money for the purpose of getting more education after you graduate from high school?

Factor 22. Participation in Education

*58. Would you be willing to borrow money for the purpose of getting more education after you graduate from high school?
64. Can you study well while you are in school?

---

* A low score on this item coincides with what the factor measures.

*65. Can you study very well while you are at home?
92. How many school clubs, teams, or other organizations have you belonged to so far this year? 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four or more

Factor 23. Location of Guidance Materials

26. Are guidance informational materials kept in the library?
*67. Do you think that you could learn more if the school day were shortened?
*89. Approximately how many times this year have you had an individual conference with a counselor in this school? 1. none 2. one 3. two-four 4. five-seven 5. eight or more

Factor 24. Self-awareness

75. Are there things about you which are different than most other people?

Factor 25. Students' Perceptions of the Value of Counseling

32. Do you think that every school should have at least one counselor who has time to help individual students?

Factor 26. Knowledge of Occupational Information

50. Do you know of at least five different occupations in which you probably could be satisfied and successful?
73. Do you know what occupations are closely related to your abilities?

Factor 27. Value Orientation

*59. Should almost everybody get a college education?
*74. Can a good aptitude test tell a student what occupation he should enter?
100. The guidance program is: 1. very bad 2. mostly bad 3. in between 4. mostly good 5. very good

---

* A low score on this item coincides with what the factor measures.

Factor 28. Guidance Program Level of Activity

*96. The guidance program is: 1. very active 2. mostly active 3. in between 4. mostly inactive 5. very inactive

Factor 29. Vocational Guidance Information

*28. Does your counselor know where students can get help if they have special emotional problems?
*57. Can students who take vocational education in high school go on to a four-year college?
*60. Are there any two-year technical schools in your state?
*74. Can a good aptitude test tell a student what occupation he should enter?

Factor 30. Guidance Program Policy

*39. Have you ever been in a class when the teacher sent a student to the counselor because the student was a discipline problem?
48. Right now does your future occupation look like it will be a good one?

---

* A low score on this item coincides with what the factor measures.

APPENDIX F

Reliability Coefficients of the GPES

Table 11

Kuder-Richardson Reliability Coefficients for the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 Based on 1,658 High School Students

Categories of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4	Reliability Coefficients
Student Perception of the Counselor (A_1)	.69
Student Perception of the Guidance Program Activities and Provisions (A_{2-7})	.74
Student Perception of the Attainment of Guidance Objectives (B)	.68
Student Identification of the Counselor as a Source of Help (D)	.52
Student Evaluation of the Guidance Program (E)	.73

APPENDIX G

Reliability Coefficients of the POI

Table 12

Reliability Coefficients for the *Personal Orientation Inventory*

POI Scales	Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 Reliability*	Test-Retest Reliability **
Time Competent (T_C)	.80	.71
Inner-Directed (I)	.82	.84
Self-Actualizing Value (SAV)	.82	.74
Existentiality (Ex)	.64	.85
Feeling Reactivity (Fr)	.08	.69
Spontaneity (S)	.52	.81
Self-Regard (Sr)	.49	.75
Self-Acceptance (Sa)	.12	.80
Nature of Man (Nc)	.47	.66
Synergy (Sy)	.10	.72
Acceptance of Aggression (A)	.34	.55
Capacity for Intimate Contact (C)	.56	.75
Time Competent (T_C) and Inner-Directed (I) Scales Combined (T_C + I)	.78	***

---

* Based on the twenty-three counselors who participated in the writer's study.

** Based on "a sample of 48 college students from a study by Klavetter and Mogar (1967)" as reported by Shostrom (1966:32).

*** Datum was not reported.

APPENDIX H

Supplementary Data

Table 13

Matrix of Correlations Between the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES)

GPES	Personal Orientation Inventory Scales				
Scales	T_C+I	T_I	T_C	O	I
A_1	.24	-.40	.39*	-.24	.15
A-2	.10	-.23	.20	-.14	.04
A-3	.46*	-.46	.47*	-.38	.37*
A-4	.40*	-.47	.46*	-.35	.31
A-5	.12	-.27	.27	-.10	.04
A-6	.33	-.48	.45*	-.36	.24
A-7	-.12	-.07	.08	.15	-.18
Mean A_{1-7}	.34	-.51	.50**	-.32	.23
Mean A_{2-7}	.38*	-.54	.52**	-.35	.26
B-1	.38*	-.31	.31	-.31	.35***
B-2	.03	-.03	.09	.16	.00
B-3	.01	-.34	.36*	.17	-.13
B-4	-.19	-.07	.06	.23	-.27
B-5	.08	-.35	.34	.06	-.04
B-6	.08	-.15	.20	.04	.02
B-7	-.08	.02	-.01	.07	-.10
Mean B	.10	-.32	.35***	.08	-.02
D	.56**	-.44	.44*	-.55	.52**
E	.33	-.34	.35***	-.28	.28
Grand Mean	.35*	-.51	.51**	-.29	.24

---

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

*** Not significant at 3 decimal places

Table 13 (Continued)

Matrix of Correlations Between the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES)

GPES	Personal Orientation Inventory Scales				
Scales	SAV	Ex	Fr	S	Sr
A_1	-.14	-.05	.16	.33	.32
A-2	.34	.18	.26	.41*	.49**
A-3	-.06	-.04	.29	.34	.18
A-4	.22	.20	.25	.08	.07
A-5	.07	-.14	.23	.33	.25
A-6	.08	-.20	.26	.44*	.36*
A-7	-.46	.18	-.31	.00	-.34
Mean A_{1-7}	-.04	-.02	.23	.40*	.29
Mean A_{2-7}	.03	.00	.26	.41*	.25
B-1	.02	.30	.16	.02	.11
B-2	-.14	-.01	.05	.11	-.13
B-3	.04	-.18	.03	.27	.23
B-4	.05	.00	-.27	.24	-.13
B-5	-.04	.13	-.33	.21	.26
B-6	-.34	-.18	.11	.19	-.09
B-7	-.28	-.03	-.04	-.06	-.15
Mean B	-.11	.03	-.07	.23	.10
D	.09	-.11	.35***	.48*	.21
E	-.21	.02	.17	.18	.09
Grand Mean	-.05	-.03	.19	.42*	.25

---

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

*** Not significant at 3 decimal places

Table 13 (Continued)

Matrix of Correlations Between the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Form A-4 (GPES)

GPES	Personal Orientation Inventory Scales				
Scales	Sa	Nc	Sy	A	C
A_1	.07	-.24	-.12	.09	.08
A-2	-.37	-.05	.16	.09	.01
A-3	.31	-.35	.02	.31	.44*
A-4	.17	-.40	.31	.32	.60**
A-5	-.05	-.29	.06	.19	.17
A-6	.12	-.37	.04	.30	.22
A-7	.01	-.02	-.09	-.04	-.11
Mean A_{1-7}	.11	-.36	.02	.24	.27
Mean A_{2-7}	.12	-.41	.11	.33	.37*
B-1	.25	-.21	.02	.30	.51**
B-2	.02	.04	.25	.08	.04
B-3	-.26	-.33	.11	-.05	.03
B-4	-.23	-.12	.23	.14	-.19
B-5	-.04	-.17	-.19	.25	.15
B-6	.15	-.17	.02	-.24	.03
B-7	.13	-.41	-.16	.43*	-.08
Mean B	-.02	-.30	.04	.21	.16
D	.41*	-.21	.00	.25	.38*
E	.16	.00	-.17	-.13	.30
Grand Mean	.14	-.37	.03	.26	.29

---

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
*** Not significant at 3 decimal places

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Personal Orientation Inventory Based On Twenty-three Counselors

Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
$T_C + I$	104.78	9.71	89 - 128
T_I	4.83	3.20	0 - 11
T_C	18.00	3.15	12 - 23
O	38.26	8.29	22 - 56
I	86.78	7.72	71 - 105
SAV	21.17	1.95	15 - 24
Ex	22.87	7.84	13 - 44
Fr	15.13	2.12	12 - 19
S	12.65	1.72	9 - 15
Sr	13.61	1.83	9 - 16
Sa	16.74	3.82	8 - 24
Nc	12.44	2.00	7 - 15
Sy	7.74	0.96	5 - 9
A	15.91	3.50	12 - 22
C	17.65	3.13	13 - 25

Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the *Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey*, Form A-4 Based on Twenty-three Groups of High School Students

Category or Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
A_1	.53	.08	.36 - .69
A-2	.36	.06	.22 - .45
A-3	.39	.12	.20 - .77
A-4	.42	.09	.27 - .58
A-5	.46	.06	.35 - .64
A-6	.63	.07	.45 - .73
A-7	.31	.06	.16 - .45
Mean A_{1-7}	.48	.06	.37 - .62
Mean A_{2-7}	.46	.05	.37 - .59
B-1	.55	.07	.43 - .71
B-2	.64	.04	.56 - .73
B-3	.48	.05	.38 - .59
B-4	.46	.06	.27 - .53
B-5	.62	.04	.50 - .69
B-6	.52	.05	.40 - .60
B-7	.72	.06	.60 - .85
Mean B	.57	.03	.51 - .63
D	.27	.08	.09 - .49
E	.07	.12	.02 - .62
Grand Mean	.47	.04	.38 - .57

APPENDIX I

Frequency Distribution of Responses to GPES

Items 101-105

Table 16

Frequency of Student Responses to Item 101: Student Rating of the Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students

Alternative	Number	Percent
Omit	225	13.60
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	157	9.50
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	176	10.60
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	246	14.80
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	675	40.70
5. Helping students with their peronsal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	179	10.80
TOTAL	1658	100

Table 17

Frequency of Student Responses to Item 102:
Student Rating of the Second Most
Important Way in which Some
Counselors Might Be of Help
to Students

Alternative	Number	Percent
Omit	225	13.60
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	253	15.30
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	332	20.00
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	356	21.50
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	309	18.60
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	183	11.00
TOTAL	1658	100

Table 18

Frequency of Student Responses to Item 103: Student Rating of the Third Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students

Alternative	Number	Percent
Omit	230	13.90
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	269	16.20
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	423	25.50
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	321	19.40
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	208	12.50
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	207	12.50
TOTAL	1658	100

Table 19

Frequency of Student Responses to Item 104: Student Rating of the Fourth Most Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students

Alternative	Number	Percent
Omit	241	14.40
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	275	16.60
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	396	23.90
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	321	19.40
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	165	10.00
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	260	15.70
TOTAL	1658	100

Table 20

Frequency of Student Responses to Item 105: Student Rating of the Least Important Way in which Some Counselors Might Be of Help to Students

Alternative	Number	Percent
Omit	256	15.40
1. Helping students select or change their schedule of school subjects	496	29.90
2. Helping students with problems in their school subjects or school activities	109	6.60
3. Helping students know more about their aptitudes, interests, or personal traits	175	10.60
4. Helping students plan for an occupation or further education after high school	68	4.10
5. Helping students with their personal problems or with the troubles they are having with other individuals	554	33.40
TOTAL	1658	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Braun, John R., and Patricia Asta. "Intercorrelations Between Personal Orientation Inventory and Gordon Personal Inventory Scores," *Psychological Reports*, 23, 3-2 (1968), 1197-1198.

Carkhuff, Robert R. "Counseling Research, Theory and Practice-1965," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13, 4 (1966), 467-480.

Cottle, William C. "Personal Characteristics of Counselors:I," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 31, 8 (1953), 445-450.

Damm, Vernon J. "Overall Measures of Self-Actualization Derived From the Personal Orientation Inventory," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 29, (1969), 977-981.

Dandes, Herbert M. "Psychological Health and Teaching Effectiveness," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XVII, 3 (1966), 301-306.

Demos, George D., and Fadil H. Zuwaylif. "Characteristics of Effective Counselors," *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 5, 3 (1966), 163-165.

Dixon, W. J. *Biomedical Computer Programs*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Donnan, Hugh H., Grady E. Harlan, and Seaborn A. Thompson. "Counselor Personality and Level of Functioning as Perceived by Counselees," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 16, 6 (1969), 482-485.

Duncan, James P. "A Rating for Student Evaluation of Residence Hall Counselors," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 45, 5 (1967), 452-454.

Educational and Industrial Testing Service. Personal correspondence between Robert R. Knapp and the writer, March 25, 1972.

Eiben, Ray E. "Counselor-Counselee Personal Orientation and Post-Interview Affect," *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:796-A, September, 1968.

Form, Arnold L. "Measurement of Student Attitudes Toward Counseling Services," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 32, 3 (1953), 84-87.

Foulds, Melvin L. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Therapeutic Conditions Offered and a Measure of Self-Actualization," *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:120-A, July, 1968.

Foulds, Melvin L. "Self-Actualization and the Communication of Facilitative Conditions During Counseling," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 2 (1969a), 132-136.

Foulds, Melvin L. "Positive Mental Health and Facilitative Genuineness During Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47, 8 (1969b), 762-766.

Foulds, Melvin L. Personal Taped Interview, March 17, 1972.

Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Frericks, Don (ed.). Directory of Ohio School Counselors. State Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing Publication. Columbus, Ohio, 1970.

Gladstein, Gerald A. "Client Expectation, Counseling Experience, and Satisfaction," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 6 (1969), 476-481.

Goodstein, Leonard D., and Austin E. Grigg. "Client Satisfaction, Counselors, and the Counseling Process," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37, 1 (1959), 19-26.

Graff, Robert W., and Harley E. Bradshaw. "Relationship of a Measure of Self-Actualization to Dormitory Assistant Effectiveness," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 6 (1970), 502-505.

Graff, Robert W., et al. "The POI: A Validity Check," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 2 (1970), 429-432.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Hekmat, Hamid, and Michael Theiss. "Self-Actualization and Modification of Affective Self-Disclosures During a Social Conditioning Interview," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 2 (1971), 101-105.

Hill, George E. "The Selection of School Counselors," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 34, 5 (1961), 355-360.

Hill, George E., and Donald A. Green. "The Selection, Preparation, and Professionalization of Guidance and Personnel Workers," Review of Educational Research, 30, 2 (1960), 115-130.

Ilardi, Robert L., and W. Theodore May. "A Reliability Study of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, VIII, 1 (1968), 68-72.

Jackson, Mozelle, and Charles L. Thompson. "Effective Counselor: Characteristics and Attitudes," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 3 (1971), 249-254.

Jenson, Ralph E. "Student Feeling About Counseling Help," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 33, 9 (1955), 498-503.

Johnson, Dorothy, et al. "The Relationship of Counselor Candidate Characteristics and Counseling Effectiveness," Counselor Education and Supervision, 6, 4 (1967), 297-304.

Knapp, Robert R. The Measurement of Self-Actualization and Its Implications - A Report of Research Based on the Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1971.

Knapp, Robert R. "Relationship of a Measure of Self-Actualization to Neuroticism and Extraversion," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 2 (1965), 168-172.

Maslow, Abraham H. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand Co., 1962.

McClain, Edwin W. "Sixteen P. F. Scores and Success in Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, XIX, 1 (1968a), 25-32.

McClain, Edwin W. "Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scores and Success in Counseling," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 6 (1968b), 492-496.

McClain, Edwin W. "Further Validation of the Personal Orientation Inventory: Assessment of Self-Actualization of School Counselors," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35, 2 (1970), 21-22.

McQuary, John P. "Preferred Counselor Characteristics," Counselor Education and Supervision, 3, 3 (1964), 145-148.

Murray, M. Eloise. "Self-Actualization and Social Values of Teachers as Related to Students' Perception of Teachers." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Patterson, C. H., "The Selection of Counselors," Research in Counseling, ed. John M. Whiteley. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1967, 69-101.

Pellegreno, Dominick. "The Personal Constructs of Counselor Enrollees." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Toledo, 1968.

Polmantier, Paul C. "The Personality of the Counselor," Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 15, 2 (1966), 95-100.

Price, Leah Z., and Marvin A. Iverson. "Students' Perception of Counselors with Varying Statuses and Role Behaviors in the Initial Interview," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 6 (1969), 469-475.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37, 1 (1958), 6-16.

Santavicca, G. Gene. "Supervised Experience and Selection of Counselor Trainees," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37, 3 (1959), 195-197.

Severinsen, K. Norman. "Client Expectation and Perception of the Counselor's Role and Their Relationship to Client Satisfaction," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 13, 1 (1966), 109-112.

Shostrom, Everett L. "An Inventory for the Measurement of Self-Actualization," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIV, 2 (1964), 207-218.

Shostrom, Everett L. Manual-Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1966.

Stefflre, Buford, Paul King, and Fred Leafgren. "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Their Peers," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 9, 4 (1962), 335-340.

Stoughton, Robert W. "The Preparation of Counselors and Personnel Workers," Review of Educational Research, 37, 2 (1957), 174-185.

Stripling, Robert O., and James L. Lister. "Selection, Preparation, and Professionalization of Specialists," Review of Educational Research, XXXIII, 2 (1963), 171-178.

Thompson, Seaborn A. "A Study of the Relationship Between Personality Factors of Counselors and Counselee Perceptions of These Counselors," Dissertation Abstracts, 29: 3427-A, April, 1969.

Thorndike, Robert L., and Elizabeth Hagen. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

Tipton, Dorothy M. "Attitudes of High School Students Toward Guidance Counselors," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30: 3805-A, March, 1969.

Tosi, Donald J., and Susan Hoffman. "A Factor Analysis of the Personal Orientation Inventory," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 12, 1 (1972), 86-92.

Tyler, Leona E. The Work of the Counselor. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Veldman, Donald J., and Robert F. Peck. "Influences on Pupil Evaluations of Student Teachers," Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 2 (1969), 103-108.

Veldman, Donald J., and Robert F. Peck. "Student Teacher Characteristics From the Pupils' Viewpoint," Journal of Educational Psychology, 54, 6 (1963), 346-355.

Walton, Francis X., and Thomas J. Sweeney. "Useful Predictors of Counseling Effectiveness," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 48, 1 (1969), 32-38.

Wharton, Wesley K. "The Relationship Between Selected Student Characteristics and Student Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness," Dissertation Abstracts, 29: 1057-A, October, 1968.

Winborn, Bob S., and Wayne Rowe. "Self-Actualization and the Communication of Facilitative Conditions-A Replication," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19, 1 (1972), 26-29.

Wortman, John P. "Fifth Grade Students' Perceptions of the Elementary School Counselor," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30: 145-A, July, 1969.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert. "The Selection and Education of Student Personnel Workers," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31, 1 (1952), 9-14.

Wysong, H. Eugene. "Evaluating Secondary School Guidance Programs: The Development and Validation of Instruments," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968.

Wysong, H. Eugene. Objectives of a School Guidance Program. State of Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing Publication. Columbus, Ohio, 1969.

Wysong, H. Eugene. Guidance Program Evaluation-Student Survey, Form A-4. revised ed. Toledo: University of Toledo Press, 1971a.

Wysong, H. Eugene. "Information for Use in Interpreting Student Survey Results: Guidance Program Evaluation Survey-Form A-4." The University of Toledo, 1971b (mimeographed.)

Wysong, H. Eugene. Personal Interview. September 27, 1971c.